

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1964

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew 5: 16: *Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.*

O Thou gracious Benefactor, kindle within our souls Thy divine light and may the luster and radiancy never grow dim or be eclipsed but become brighter and brighter until the dawning of that perfect day.

Grant that the legislation enacted by the Congress may always be reasonable and practical and helpful in lifting the burden which weighs so heavily upon the backs and hearts of a vast number of the members of the human family.

May we never be discouraged by the multitude and magnitude of our appointed tasks or allow our sense of their difficulty to exceed our sense of Thy divine power and willingness to supply mankind's every need.

God forbid that we should ever forget Thy great goodness and expect Thee to deal with us in some preferential manner.

May we never be indifferent in our attitude toward our fellow men who also love life and are struggling for the more abundant blessings.

Hear us in His name who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8925. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide that a disability which has been rated at or above a certain percentage for 20 or more years may not thereafter be reduced below such percentage;

H.R. 8999. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of certain inhabitants of the United States living in the area inundated by the sudden floods of the Rio Grande as a result of the construction of the Falcon Dam, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11255. An act to validate certain payments of per diem allowances made to members of the Coast Guard.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6034. An act for the relief of Robert L. Johnston; and

H.R. 11466. An act to enact subtitle II, "Other Commercial Transactions", of title 28, "Commercial Instruments and Transactions", of the District of Columbia Code, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1642. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1991. An act to charter by act of Congress the National Tropical Botanical Garden.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 564. An act to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations;

S. 1365. An act to establish the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes;

S. 3075. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government", had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 65-3.

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET LEVY ON U.S. LONG GRAIN RICE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by friends in the rice industry that the European Common Market is proposing to place a high levy on imports of U.S. long grain rice, starting September 1.

It is said that the proposed duties would amount to 25 to 35 percent of landed value on brown rice, which is the principal kind of rice imported by the Common Market countries. There has been no duty on this rice up to now.

As my district of the State of Texas is a major producer of long grain rice,

I am greatly disturbed by this information.

For several years the Common Market has been one of the best dollar markets for our long grain rice. One-fourth of the cash dollar export sales of U.S. rice of the long grain type has been going to Common Market countries. This business represents \$17 million of income annually to our growers of long grain rice.

The proposal to impose high duties on U.S. long grain rice is particularly unreasonable in view of the fact that the Common Market does not even produce any rice of the long grain type. Production in the EEC is entirely short and medium soft cooking types that have a special consumer demand quite different from the dry cooking long grain varieties grown in the United States.

I hope our Government will study carefully whatever is done against our rice, and will forcefully seek remedy for any damages inflicted on our rice industry. The Europeans should be reminded that the United States is an excellent market for numerous European products including Volkswagens, Renaults, and fine wines. U.S. policy on import restrictions on those products should correspond with European policy on our products.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 209]

Ashbrook	Evins	Norblad
Auchincloss	Fulton, Tenn.	Passman
Avery	Gray	Pilcher
Baring	Hagan, Ga.	Pool
Bass	Hansen	Powell
Beckworth	Harding	Pucinski
Bennett, Mich.	Healey	Roberts, Ala.
Brotzman	Jennings	Senner
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Burton, Calif.	Jones, Mo.	Siler
Clausen	Kee	Smith, Iowa
Don H.	Lankford	Staeble
Cleveland	Lennon	Steed
Daddario	Lesinski	Toll
Davis, Tenn.	Long, Md.	Udall
Edmondson	Martin, Calif.	
Everett	Nedzi	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

17953

August 7

TO PROMOTE THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1145) to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace; and

Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] is recognized.

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain editorials.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate passage of this resolution. It is a timely and effective expression of approval and support for the President in the actions he has taken to meet the attacks on our naval forces in southeast Asia by Communists in North Vietnam. The resolution declares full support for the President's resolute policy to prevent further aggression, or make suitable

retaliation if additional attacks should occur.

The preamble concisely sets forth the background of this Communist aggression in which North Vietnamese naval units in violation of both international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter, made unprovoked attacks on U.S. naval vessels on patrol in international waters. These attacks are part of the systematic aggression which has been waged by the North Vietnamese Communist against its neighbors and those joined with them in defense of their freedom. The preamble also makes clear the fact that although the United States is assisting the people of southeast Asia to protect their freedom, we have absolutely no territorial, military, or political ambitions in that area. We desire only to have these people left in peace to work out their own destinies.

The "resolve" part of the resolution is in three sections. The first approves and supports what the President is doing to repel and prevent these attacks on our forces.

The second section highlights U.S. policy in southeast Asia. It emphasizes that the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace, the maintenance of international peace and security in that area. Subject to the Constitution of the United States, and consonant with the U.N. Charter, as well as our obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, approval is expressed for the President to take all "necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." The "protocol states" are Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam. It would apply, at present, only to South Vietnam, as Cambodia has eliminated itself voluntarily, and Laos would be inhibited by provisions of the 1962 accords.

Section 3 follows closely the termination provisions of the earlier resolutions on Formosa and the Middle East. The resolution is to expire when the President determines that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise. Provision is also made that the resolution may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched on only the highpoints, as the detailed facts and background are fully covered in the President's message and in the statements presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee by Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara. These statements, which contain as much information as could be declassified, have been printed as an appendix to the committee's report on this resolution.

The President is to be commended, not only for his prompt and vigorous action to protect our national interests and security, but also for following the precedents and coming to the Congress for approval and support. This is definitely not an advance declaration of war.

The committee has been assured by the Secretary of State that the constitutional prerogative of the Congress in this respect will continue to be scrupulously observed.

This resolution provides us the opportunity to demonstrate to the Communist aggressors that the people of the United States are united in their firm resolve to protect ourselves, to resist attack, and to take prompt and appropriate means to prevent aggression.

I ask its immediate passage in our national interest.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Aug. 6, 1964]

A NATION UNITED

In this grim, dark hour—when the issue of peace or war hangs precariously in the balance—President Johnson has called upon the American people to meet the test of courage and determination that has been thrust suddenly and irrevocably upon us all by a treacherous foe.

The Nation must stand firm and united in unwavering support of the President at this crucial juncture in the history of mankind.

We are confident that Americans irrespective of political party, shall do so—in keeping with the highest traditions of this country in times of crisis.

In his solemn address to the world on Wednesday, at Syracuse, Mr. Johnson reiterated and expanded upon points he made late Tuesday night in his report on the swift succession of ominous events in southeast Asia.

The President is right, beyond any question, in making it clear to the leaders of Communist North Vietnam, and to any other government bent on unprovoked aggression, that America's earnest desire for peace is not to be misconstrued as weakness.

Delivering one of the finest addresses of his long career in public service, Mr. Johnson summed up the situation succinctly at Syracuse in these terse phrases: "The attacks were deliberate. The attacks were unprovoked. The attacks have been answered."

After the North Vietnamese torpedo boats had opened fire against U.S. naval craft in international waters, for the second time in 3 days, it was unmistakably clear that the American reply, in action as well as words, needed to be prompt and appropriately forceful—commensurate with the seriousness of the North Vietnamese challenge and the flagrant disregard they showed for the rights of our vessels to sail the seas without interference.

These rights have been hard-won, over many years, by valiant Americans. Freedom of movement on the oceans must be defended.

Retaliatory U.S. air strikes against North Vietnamese torpedo-boat bases and other installations, as reported by Defense Secretary McNamara, unfortunately have resulted in the loss of American planes and, possibly, American lives. This sorrowful and tragic development underlines not only the perils that must be faced in the battle zone but the sacrifices that all of us must be prepared to accept.

"Aggression unchallenged is aggression unleashed," the President said at Syracuse. This is undeniable truth. To retreat from, or even to tolerate, armed attack against vessels of the U.S. Navy would be to invite steadily bolder assaults that would lead us surely and inevitably down the path of war.

Mr. Johnson's notation of broken promises made by the North Vietnamese Government, in pacts signed by them in 1954 and 1962, is a timely reminder of the demonstrated untrustworthiness of the Red regime in Hanoi. It is fitting also that the President, while re-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17955

affirming this country's commitments to Allies, has reminded those Allies that the fight for freedom ought not to be the sole burden of any one nation, but should be a collective responsibility. Our Allies—in NATO, in the Far East and elsewhere—can help the cause of peace by giving unqualified indorsement to U.S. action against North Vietnam.

Freedom and peace remain our goals—but let those forces of enslavement and armed aggression abroad who have unleashed their fire against us give pause. They will do well to show a healthy respect for America's resolve to defend, by whatever means necessary, our rights on the high seas and to carry out, by whatever action required, our obligations abroad in the struggle against Communist aggression.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Aug. 6, 1964]

FLEXIBLE RESPONSE

The sudden flareup of hot war in Vietnam provides a vital test of the flexible defense strategy favored by the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

We have responded vigorously to the renewed attacks by North Vietnamese PT boats. But the response was, in Mr. Johnson's words, "limited and fitting." We struck back at the PT boats and their bases, not at North Vietnam as a whole or its armed forces.

Our real strength, even that part of it which is immediately available in southeast Asia, is still in reserve.

This, of course, was all carefully planned in advance. As early as the spring of 1961 President Kennedy ordered a buildup of our conventional forces so that in the event of attack we would not be forced "to choose between doing nothing and deliberately initiating nuclear war."

It meant, according to a review by Secretary McNamara, that we must be prepared to handle with non-nuclear arms military threats ranging "from guerrilla and subversive activities, involving small scattered bands of men, to organized aggression, involving sizable regular military forces."

The threat has now come in the Gulf of Tonkin. And it is obvious that we have more than enough deployed strength to deal with it at its present level.

We still do not know whether the strategy will work, because we do not know whether a minor naval battle will escalate into something more serious. President Johnson accepts the risk of escalation and the country accepts it with him. "We Americans know," the President said Tuesday, "although others appear to forget, the risks of spreading conflict."

The next move is up to the Reds. If they seek a wider war, they can have it. The President has left no doubt we shall see the struggle through. His bold words, "No peace by aggression and no immunity from reply," have already become part of the American legend.

But because of our flexible strength, because we were able to answer first in a "limited and fitting way," the chances of avoiding a major showdown are good.

The flexible defense strategy has given us options which may make a life-or-death difference for our generation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 5, 1964]

THE GULF OF TONKIN

Premier Nguyen Khanh of South Vietnam makes sense.

He points out that President Johnson warned the Asian Communists against the "very dangerous game" they have been playing in southeast Asia. And that the Communist answer has now come. It is intensified war—both in South Vietnam and in

torpedo boat attacks on an American destroyer off the North Vietnam coast.

The United States, General Khanh said, now has to prove it was not a paper tiger.

The immediate response, from President Johnson was being announced in Washington even as the South Vietnamese Premier spoke in Saigon. It was the obvious response. The Navy was instructed to destroy any such attacker in future. The orders were deliberately ambiguous. When the second attack came they permitted hot pursuit and counterattack on the torpedo boat bases—which are presumably bases for sea supplies to the Vietcong. This in turn touched off a general American mobilization in the area.

This is a good deal. It will tend to narrow the differences between President Johnson and Senator GOLDWATER as the Senator himself agreed. The Johnson move is not without precedent. Former President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles used the 7th Fleet at several tense moments to threaten naval action in the Formosa Strait. Mr. Johnson would have had to act even without Senator GOLDWATER's prodding.

But the Senator wants to go further and it is quite possible that events will now push the President to meet him part way. The Senator questioned whether larger American ground forces will have to be landed. This may well have to be done. The United States is in this war somewhat indirectly; and as General Khanh suggested, it is not doing well. It may have to go into action directly. Already it is taking semiclandestine methods of cutting the Communist supply lines by land and sea—that is why the destroyer was patrolling. Where it divides from Senator GOLDWATER is in striking close to mainland China or inside China, which could lead to the brink of general war.

The domestic politics of the situation only reflect the state of the war and the political problems that surround it. The United States is unavoidably going in further. The only questions are when and how far.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 5, 1964]

THE 7TH FLEET HITS BACK

President Johnson's order to the 7th Fleet to bomb North Vietnamese PT boats and the "facilities" from which they operate is fully justified. This is accurately described as a "limited" response. But it may lead nonetheless to an expansion of the war in southeast Asia, and we as a nation must be ready for any eventuality.

The motives of the North Vietnamese are hard to fathom. For they are provoking conflict with a vastly superior force in an area and under conditions which are favorable to us and highly unfavorable to them. Whatever the motives, however, there can be no doubt that the attacks were made and that they were deliberate.

When the PT boats first fired their torpedoes at the U.S.S. *Maddox* there was some thought that this was an isolated incident, not part of a purposeful plan. But the second attack, occurring some 65 miles off the coast in the Gulf of Tonkin removes all doubt. This was deliberate, and Hanoi's claim that the whole thing is "a sheer fabrication" is so absurd that few if any will believe it.

The North Vietnamese are thought to have, or to have had, about 16 Russian-built PT boats. We trust that the Navy's fighter-bombers will be able to locate and destroy them. For that evidently is the only way to make certain that there will be no further attacks on American warships engaged in lawful missions on the high seas.

What counteraction if any will come from the other side remains to be seen. If they react forcibly, however, it would be logical to expect some enlargement of the war

against South Vietnam. That this has been anticipated is evidenced by the report that the United States is sending "substantial" additional military elements to southeast Asia.

We hope that "substantial" means that the additional elements will be adequate for any purpose. Our response to the PT boat attacks should disabuse the Communist mind of the "paper tiger" fiction. But if the war in the south is stepped up we should not be content merely to hold our ground. Our purpose, as contrasted to Korea, should be to destroy the enemy and the sources from which his attacks are being mounted.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Aug. 5, 1964]

OUR RESPONSE: "LIMITED AND FITTING"

President Johnson's response to the latest Communist challenge in the Gulf of Tonkin was quick, decisive, and restrained. The United States could not permit the second attack in 2 days on its naval vessels on the high seas to go unanswered. A sharp and unmistakable reply was indicated. This was ordered by the President.

And yet, Mr. Johnson made it clear that the United States does not intend to provoke an escalation of the war in Vietnam. He said in his brief radio-television address to the Nation Tuesday night:

"Our response, for the present, will be limited and fitting. We Americans know, although others appear to forget, the risks of spreading conflict—we still seek no wider war."

Sunday's attack on the destroyer *Maddox*, on patrol in international waters, by three patrol-torpedo boats might have been deliberate or it might have been an accident, so the United States reply was defensive in nature. But there can be little question about the deliberateness of yesterday's assault by a larger force.

The reason for the attacks is a complete mystery. Superficially, it would seem to be madness on the part of the Communists to challenge U.S. seapower, by far the most formidable in the world. The Communists' best weapon, as they must know, is the type of guerrilla warfare they have been conducting in Vietnam. Why did they choose to strike directly at the United States where it is supreme—on the high seas?

It seems to us that President Johnson's handling of this whole episode thus far should instill confidence in the people. He took no steps without consulting his advisers and congressional leaders, and he broadcast a calm summary when the decisions had been made.

It is particularly encouraging that Mr. Johnson instructed Ambassador Stevenson to make our position clear at once to the United Nations and to raise the matter before the Security Council. If the Vietnamese war can be brought before the United Nations the gains might be incalculable.

And Mr. Johnson also was wise, we think, to seek a congressional resolution "making it clear that our Government is united in its determination to take all necessary measures in support of freedom, and in defense of peace, in southeast Asia." Mr. Johnson, the Commander in Chief, does not need authority to act. But in this election year it would be prudent to put the world on notice, lest there be any misunderstandings, that the United States is indeed united.

This is the reason why Mr. Johnson communicated as soon as he could with Senator GOLDWATER, the Republican presidential nominee who has been critical of administration foreign policy, to obtain his approval of Mr. Johnson's broadcast statement. And it was commendable of Senator GOLDWATER to give his support.

Congressional debate on Mr. Johnson's proposed resolution might well prove of great value. It will be remembered that when the

17956

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 7

so-called Formosa resolution was debated in the Senate in 1955 Senator Morse, at the risk of being charged with filibustering, pried into all the nooks and crannies of U.S. policy with respect to the Chiang Kai-shek regime. The result was an extremely important contribution to public understanding of the issues involved.

Too little is known at present about the naval and air action to form a considered judgment on it. But discussion in Congress and the United Nations, together with disclosure of more details, particularly as to Communist motivations, should give Americans a much firmer basis on which to determine future policy.

The prudence and wisdom of the positive retaliation we have undertaken will be judged by its consequences. If American firmness contributes to a negotiated political solution of the conflict in Vietnam—indeed in all Indochina—it will be recorded as a turning point. If it leads to intensification of hostilities and deeper military involvement in Asia its value to America's self-interest will be severely challenged.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Aug. 7, 1964]

RESOLUTION IN CRISIS

The gathering together of the Nation's resources at times of grave crisis is admirably reflected in the dispatch with which Congress has moved to associate itself with President Johnson's directives in southeast Asia. The joint resolution authorizing the Chief Executive to take "all necessary measures" to repel attack and to extend assistance in the defense of allies throughout southeast Asia is a broad expression of confidence, but its chief usefulness is not as a grant of power. Its primary purpose is to demonstrate to enemies who may yet be considering provocative excursions that the United States, in full unity, is wholly determined to yield neither principle nor territory to ruthless aggressors.

The resolution is not the only earnest of American intent. While the House and Senate deliberated yesterday, reinforcing ships and planes were moving into position to meet new thrusts—whether they come again from North Vietnam or openly from Red China. If the fighting spreads in the wake of the retaliatory strike against Hanoi, however, it will not be by American choice. That blow was a one-time operation, not to be repeated unless there are new forays from the other side. Subsequent military deployment has been solely a defensive precaution.

While opposing forces stand tensely in border zones, watching carefully for ominous motion, the United Nations Security Council is going ahead with plans to hear from the two Vietnams. If open conflict can be avoided before the talking starts, some of the heat may be taken out of the crisis. If North Vietnam can make any defense of the attacks on American ships, the world would like to hear it. The United States will not wait idly for an explanation which may never come. Until the threat of aggression has receded the ramparts will be manned, and the soldier or airman at the most distant outpost has the support of his Government and his people. That is what the congressional resolution tells the world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 7, 1964]

DEMOCRACY'S RESPONSE

Congress is responding with commendable promptness and with an almost unanimous voice to President Johnson's request for support in the southeast Asia crisis. The President consulted the leaders of both houses and then asked for a supporting resolution not only because he felt the necessity for congressional approval of what is being done, but also because he wished to demonstrate before the world the unity of the American

people in resisting Communist aggression. That unity has been demonstrated despite the reckless and querulous dissent of Senator Morse.

There is no substance in Senator Morse's charge that the resolution amounts to a "pre-dated declaration of war." On the contrary, it reaffirms the longstanding policy of the United States of aiding the states covered by the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty in the protection of their freedom as a contribution to international peace. It pledges military action only to resist aggression against American forces in that area. Of course, the President has authority to respond to attacks upon American forces without any approval in advance by Congress. So the resolution means only a recommitment of the Nation to the policy it has been following—an almost unanimous recommitment in the face of the inexplicable North Vietnamese challenge.

This means of reasserting the national will, far short of a declaration of war, follows sound precedents set in other crises. President Johnson noted in his message to Congress that similar resolutions had been passed at the request of President Eisenhower in connection with the threat to Formosa in 1955 and the threat to the Middle East in 1957. The same course was followed in 1962 at the request of President Kennedy to meet the missile threat in Cuba. None of these emergencies led to war. Rather, the firm action that this country took interrupted Communist maneuvers that might otherwise have led to war.

Congress ought to be very pleased with the now firm establishment of this mechanism for meeting an emergency with a united front. Reliance solely upon the power of Congress to declare war as a last resort would not be appropriate in these days of repeated crises short of war. A resolution of support for the Executive arm in meeting an emergency has all the virtue of rallying national strength behind a firm policy—without taking the calamitous step of war in this nuclear age. We surmise that the almost unanimous sentiment behind this resolution on Capitol Hill reflects appreciation for the President's sharing of responsibility as well as support for the tough punishment for aggression that he initiated.

COMMUNISM'S CHOICE

Time will doubtless improve on speculation's answer to the question of why Communist forces fired at the American Navy and how they will respond to the American hits on their soil. In the interim, we can be sure only that the next step is up to Hanoi and Peiping, that the decision is even more critical for them than for us, and that not only the conflict in Indochina but the power outlook in the Far East is at stake.

The sequence since Sunday is of a kind which forces those touched by it to define and declare themselves by their reactions. Hanoi has shown outrage but it is unable alone to match its feeling with action. Peiping, going further, has added an ambiguous pledge of solidarity which does not particularize the conditions that would require it to take a designated act. Moscow, caught off guard, has huffed disingenuously as though snorts would remove its embarrassing pinch between comradeship and self-interest. The lack of similarity between these Communist reactions is as striking as the lack of specificity.

The operational issue lies at the intersection of three streams of reality: the Sino-Soviet dispute, East-West relations, and war or peace. The issue is the danger of confrontation with free world power. The Soviets feel that the danger is so great as to require avoidance; the Chinese, not so great as to preclude struggle for desired goals. The Soviets fear that a small conflict involving a great power could become a big

one, with universally disastrous results. The Chinese scoff at the dangers of such escalation. From the American viewpoint, the difference is that between manageable trouble and open-ended war.

From the spectrum of choices available to them, the Communists must now select those that satisfy the conflicting demands of prudence and pride. They have not been militarily rash in the past, with the crucial and upsetting exception of the torpedo forays in the Tonkin Gulf. Having answered those attacks in full measure, the United States must now hope to draw the conflict into diplomatic outlets, even while it prepares to meet further military challenges in Indochina.

A debate in the United Nations would be a bruising one, particularly if a representative of North Vietnam took part. It would expose the United States to a propagandistic onslaught on all its Indochina policies and would produce a bewildering array of information, half-truths, and falsifications about events there. However, a country in the position of answering aggression need have no scruples about upholding its case in an international forum.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Aug. 4, 1964]

ATTACK ON THE U.S.S. "MADDOX"

For the moment only the leaders in Hanoi, and quite probably Peiping as well, know for sure what motivated the attack by three North Vietnamese torpedo boats on the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Motivation, however, no longer seems particularly important in view of the U.S. reaction. If the Communists hoped to show that an American presence in the gulf area makes for a dangerous situation they succeeded, but not in the way they intended.

President Johnson has ordered an increase in U.S. naval strength in the Gulf of Tonkin, and the orders for our forces there have been changed. Where formerly these orders were to defend but not to pursue, they now read defend and destroy. If the North Vietnamese or Chinese have any notion of claiming the gulf as their own private pond they will first have to deal with the U.S. 7th Fleet.

The fact that pursuit of attackers was previously ruled out probably explains why the three torpedo boats weren't all blown out of the water. All of them, according to reports, were hit, and one probably sank.

Had the Navy been permitted to take more than defensive measures it seems likely that the *Maddox* and the four rocket-firing carrier planes that joined in her defense would easily have destroyed all the attackers.

Certainly the Communists could not have been ignorant of the proximity of U.S. air power when they made their Sunday attack. For that matter they no doubt knew that the *Maddox* alone had the torpedo boats outgunned.

It may well be that the attack was a suicide mission plain and simple, the thinking being that the propaganda value to be gained from sinking an American ship outweighed the material risks involved.

The United States has chosen to regard the attack as an isolated harassing action, and this seems sound. Legally, the 7th Fleet has every right to be in international waters as the Communists, legalists that they are, well know. Militarily, it simply makes no sense for the Reds to carry their war to the sea, where they are hopelessly outclassed.

The quick and firm response to the attack, first by the Navy and then by the President, should be warning enough to the Communists not to try such foolishness again.

[From the New York Post, Aug. 6, 1964]

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

Clearly the United States does not seek a wider war. Let us hope Asia's Communists

do not either. The initial Soviet response, as given by Tass, was quite restrained. While deploring U.S. "aggressive actions," the statement avoided committing Moscow to doing anything about them.

At the U.N. the Soviet delegate was equally restrained. His request that a representative of North Vietnam be invited to participate was doubly significant.

It served to suggest that Moscow did not know what its Communist brethren in Asia were up to. It also set up interesting possibilities of dividing Hanoi from Peiping.

Whatever Russia's motives, there is every reason to invite North Vietnam.

"It is a solemn responsibility," said President Johnson Tuesday night when he disclosed an air strike was in progress, "to have to order even limited military action by forces whose overall strength is as vast and as awesome as those of the United States of America."

That awesome strength makes it all the more baffling that the North Vietnamese should be seeking to provoke us. Direct contact with the representatives of Hanoi may shed some light on this.

North Vietnam may not like our vessels presence in the Tonkin Gulf. The Communists have always been sensitive about their frontiers—almost of the point of paranoia. But neither does the United States exactly welcome electronically equipped Soviet vessels carrying on continuous surveillance off Cape Kennedy.

But we put up with it. The right of ships to voyage on the high seas is incontestable. The response of the United States was wholly predictable. The question remains: Why did Hanoi do it?

The more basic question, however, is, Where are we heading in Vietnam? Are we being sucked into a dark tunnel from which there may be no egress?

Ambassador Stevenson eloquently stated our case. But it was a limited brief, largely restricted to justifying our air strikes under the right of self-defense set forth in article 51 of the U.N. Charter.

We owed this explanation to the U.N. But the U.N. should be more than a sounding board.

The smaller nations, those not directly involved in the dispute, and therefore capable of some detachment, should be encouraged to come forward with proposals for mediation, perhaps conciliation.

Several weeks ago U Thant called for a new Geneva Conference. If the parties involved in the war could reach an agreement, Thant said, the U.N. could play a role in seeing that the agreement was carried out. "Even at this late hour," he suggested, "means might be found to end the war."

Nothing happened. The United States is again perilously close to a major military venture on the Asian mainland. Surely before we venture further, a major effort should be made to open up channels of communication with our adversaries.

"Blessed are the peacemakers," said President Johnson in June, quoting the Bible in a foreign policy speech that coupled firmness with an olive branch.

Provocative as the Communists have been, that still remains true.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes before us as the result of the recent and dramatic episode in southeast Asia. The evidence is overwhelming that our ships, on regular patrol duty moving in international

waters, were subject to deliberate and unprovoked attacks. These were not accidents; nor can they be dismissed as incidents.

Let us be clear what we are doing if we pass this resolution. We are not establishing a precedent. On four previous occasions, dating back to 1955, the Congress has recognized that an expression of its approval and support for the President in moments of international tension has served a salutary purpose in his conduct of international affairs.

Our adversaries have already put their propaganda machines to work and we need to make our stand very clear. Every honorable approach that will assist the peoples of southeast Asia to live and work in peace will be fully and candidly examined. At the same time we serve notice that we are prepared to use our military strength to repel with whatever degree of force is necessary any attacks upon our forces.

As you know, the immediate purpose of this resolution arose out of attacks upon our ships engaged in routine patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those occasions when all of us, of whatever political persuasion, unite behind our Commander in Chief. I hope this resolution will receive the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this resolution supports the determination of the President of the United States to take all necessary measures, including the use of armed force, to repel any armed attack on forces of the United States, to prevent further aggression, and to defend the peace and security of southeast Asia.

At this time the United States is facing the most serious military confrontation since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. All of us are aware of the recent developments in the Gulf of Tonkin and the threat that this poses for the peace of southeast Asia.

Ships of the U.S. Navy have been attacked twice by PT-type boats from Communist North Vietnam. These attacks have taken place against American vessels which were lawfully present in international waters off the coast of Vietnam, and were deliberate and unprovoked acts of aggression. For 10 years and through the terms of three American Presidents, the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been violating international agreements and provoking the United States with its belligerent behavior. These two recent and unjustifiable attacks against American ships and American men have brought the only response possible: we have struck back not only at their attacking ships, but at the bases of the attacking power, that is, against the original point of aggression.

In this time of trouble, the President has asked the Members of Congress to act at once on a congressional resolution expressing U.S. determination to take

such measures as may be necessary to support freedom, and to defend peace in southeast Asia. It is a resolution that States, in words clear and concise, the principles and the policy that this country has adopted and upon which we stand united.

Similar resolutions have been passed at other crucial times in our history. Such resolutions since the 1950's have received overwhelming bipartisan support from this Chamber. In January of 1955, President Eisenhower asked Congress for emergency authorization to use American armed might to protect Formosa and the Pescadores Islands. He wanted to use the 7th Fleet, the same fleet that is patrolling the sea off the coast of Vietnam today. Two years later, in January 1957, President Eisenhower asked Congress for a mandate to use American Armed Forces at his discretion in the Middle East. And, in September of 1962, both Houses of Congress in a joint resolution stated that President Kennedy should use whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, to fight communism in Cuba and in this hemisphere.

In every case, Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan congressional support has had the same effect—to let both friend and foe know that in time of crisis the American people will not permit party differences to divide them in meeting their responsibilities in the world.

The United States is presently facing in southeast Asia a challenge similar to the ones we have faced in the past in Turkey, Berlin, Lebanon, the Straits of Taiwan, and Cuba. The President has asked us as representatives of the American people for our support. It is now time for all of us to join together as a nation firmly united behind our Commander in Chief and to express our complete confidence in him and in his leadership.

At the end of his speech in Syracuse this week, the President said, and these are words that deserve the close attention of people everywhere: "Let not friend needlessly fear nor foe vainly hope that this is a nation divided in this election year. Our free election, our full and free debate are America's strength, not America's weakness."

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio in urging prompt enactment of this resolution.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, our minority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

May I say first of all it is public knowledge that the congressional leaders from both sides of the aisle were called to a meeting at the White House last Tuesday evening. At that time we were given information concerning decisions with respect to certain military activities in the Gulf of Tonkin area. I think it should be made clear, and properly so, at this time, that orders for retaliatory action against the forces of North Vietnam had been issued prior to the meeting and

that the apparent purpose of the meeting was to inform us that such decision had been made.

I do not say this in any critical fashion at all because, as I pointed out originally, I support the President in his decision as stated at the White House the other evening. As a matter of fact, I have said on a number of occasions here on the floor of the House, and at the White House when circumstances seemed to indicate such comment might be in order that on matters concerning the security of our country, and particularly when those matters involve armed aggression against the property and people of the United States and our flag, I stand with the President of the United States.

I think we all should realize that the enactment of this resolution does not solve all of our problems in southeast Asia. There will continue to be serious problems. Developments and policies of our Government will, as they have in the past, continue in the future to arouse the intense interest of the American people, and will likewise continue to involve the deep concern of all of us.

Having said as much, I say again I support this resolution as a clear indication on the part of the Congress of our determination to be a united people in the face of any threats to our liberty.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the resolution which is before us today. This is similar to but not identical with previous resolutions to which reference has been made—the Formosa resolution, the Middle East resolution, and others.

There was some concern in the Committee on Foreign Affairs about certain of the wording in this resolution. It is my understanding that that objection is being met, at least in part, by action taken in the other body and by action proposed by the chairman here today.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the chairman. I think this is a step in the proper direction.

There are two points about which Members have expressed concern, especially, in this resolution: In the first place, if we vote for it are we abdicating our congressional rights and our congressional responsibilities with respect to the declaration of war and with respect to foreign affairs generally?

This matter was raised in committee and we were given assurance that it was the attitude of the Executive that such was not the case, that we are not impairing our congressional prerogatives.

Secondly, the question has been raised as to whether by voting for this resolution we say in effect that we are approving all of the U.S. policies in southeast Asia in the past and are giving approval, in advance, for such actions as the President may see fit to take in the future. Here again the answer is in the negative. By voting for this resolution it is my understanding that we are meeting a specific situation. The American flag has been fired on. We are saying we will not and cannot tolerate such things. We

will stand in defense of our flag and our freedoms solidly behind the President. This we are saying by this resolution.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Do I correctly understand that section 2 of this resolution does constitute an implementation of article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty itself? This treaty says that in the event of danger there will be measures taken in each country in accordance with its constitutional basis? In other words, does this resolution give positive powers to the President to act with respect to our responsibilities as a member of SEATO?

Mr. ADAIR. It does so. Within the framework the gentleman has described, and, of course, subject to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as cosponsor of the joint resolution to promote the maintenance of peace and security in southeast Asia, I urge its adoption by my colleagues.

We are well aware of events in the past few days in which U.S. naval vessels were repeatedly attacked on two different occasions in international waters by naval craft of North Vietnam.

Our destroyers eluded injury to their ships and men on each of these occasions, and managed to sink or seriously cripple three of the attacking North Vietnam patrol boats.

In quick response to this unprovoked aggression on the high seas, naval aircraft from our carriers destroyed or damaged 25 North Vietnamese patrol boats. In addition, extensive damage was done to the bases and fuel stores for these boats.

This is not the first occasion in our Nation's history when our ships were subjected to attack on the high seas. Let us hope it is the last.

Any study of American history by the North Vietnamese or their Red Chinese masters would have quickly revealed the folly of such action. Since the attackers did not study history, it is our hope that they have the ability to learn by experience.

One of the reasons we are considering adoption of this joint resolution today is that we do know what happens if such aggression and provocation on the part of the North Vietnamese Communist regime goes unpunished.

We are well aware of the many occasions of invasion, of infiltration, or subversion and terror which have been spread by this regime to its peaceful neighbors.

We are well aware of the fact that these latest attacks involving our naval vessels is only one instance in a chain of outrages since the Communists gained control of North Vietnam.

Also, we are well aware that the North Vietnamese are not capable of continuing their aggressive policies against their southeast Asian neighbors without considerable amounts of outside assistance.

We know, for instance, that the patrol boats which attempted the unprovoked assaults upon our naval craft were manufactured in the Soviet Union. We know further that Red China has contributed considerable amounts of arms, equipment, and even manpower to further whet the aggressive appetite for conquest of North Vietnam's leaders.

This resolution states specifically that the Congress:

Approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

It further states that the United States:

Regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

And that the United States is prepared, as the President determines, to:

Take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

This defense of freedom in southeast Asia is not a new obligation for the United States. In 1954 when Indochina was divided and the new, independent nations of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were created, our Nation realized that North Vietnamese aggression and preoccupation with the territory of its neighbors were going to be a persistent problem.

South Vietnam almost immediately asked us, for help, which we promptly furnished. In 1954 the Manila Pact was negotiated, a collective defense treaty between Thailand, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the United States, Britain, and France, extending protection to South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

By 1959 the Communist leaders of North Vietnam started a campaign of terror, subversion, and murder in South Vietnam. Government officials were shot by assassins sent from north of the border. Public installations were blown apart by saboteurs. Every possible device was used by the Reds to spread terror, confusion, and chaos throughout South Vietnam.

As the terror tactics increased and as the North Vietnamese became increasingly more open in their attacks and their infiltration, the United States was forced to increase its supporting assistance to South Vietnam.

We have seen the same terror tactics used by the Reds in North Vietnam against another neighbor, Laos. The most recent Communist move was the military offensive against neutralist forces which began this past May. The

neutralists were driven from the Plain of Jars by the Reds. To meet this threat, our Government provided Laos with additional aircraft and carried out reconnaissance missions. When these aircraft were fired upon, we supplied fighter cover to give them protection.

It can be seen that the Government of the United States has protected those nations in southeast Asia unable to protect themselves for a number of years. We must certainly intend to continue this protection, to help them drive the invaders from their shores and attain the goals of peace, freedom, and security from aggression for their peoples.

Why is it so necessary that the United States be committed so deeply in South Vietnam? Why is it necessary that so many Americans be subjected to the threat of death in that faraway part of the world? Why is it necessary that our destroyers patrol the Gulf of Tonkin, some 65 miles off the North Vietnamese coast?

The first reality is that we are not only dealing with North Vietnam in this conflict. We are also dealing with Red China, and in some degree, with the Soviet Union.

The next reality is that while South Vietnam and Laos are immediate goals for the Communists, they are far from being their ultimate objectives in this important part of the world.

If South Vietnam and Laos should fall, the tiny nations of Cambodia and Thailand would find themselves under almost impossible pressure. They could quickly fall to Red infiltration tactics. The next victim undoubtedly would be Malaysia, a country with a small population, a tiny Army and great wealth. In Malaysia is Singapore—a port of extreme importance strategically and economically. Singapore is comparable to Gibraltar or the Panama Canal. Whoever controls this passageway controls the sea highways to Europe, to the Near East, and Africa.

The newly independent nation of Malaysia is already under extreme pressure from its bullying neighbor to the south, Indonesia, whose leader, Sukarno, has made no bones about the fact that he intends to destroy Malaysia and grab its wealth for himself as soon as he is able to do so without suffering too much in the process.

Sukarno has followed Hitler's policy of guns before butter. He lets his people go hungry so that he can build up his army and navy. His submarine fleet is the second largest in the Pacific, second only to that of the Soviet Union in that respect. His army is the largest military force in southeast Asia.

His armed forces have modern equipment, including ground-to-air missiles, landing craft, jet fighters and bombers, all supplied by the Soviet Union. Indonesia is the fifth most populous nation in the world, with 100 million citizens, and it is ruled by a man who has declared himself president for life.

Sukarno already has been successful in grabbing Dutch New Guinea by threatening invasion, and he seems convinced that the same bullying tactics will eventually yield him Malaysia.

Unless the South Vietnamese, with our help, are able to hold the line and prevent the Communist vise from closing on southeast Asia, that part of the world could quickly swing from the side of freedom to the half-life of a Red puppet state.

The rich resources of the Malay Peninsula—both human and natural—would fall into the hands of the Red Chinese, resources which the Chinese Communists need to carry out future aggressions against such neighbors as India. In this rich area they could grow the rice and other food and fiber crops so badly needed. They could mine the tin, refine the oil, and grow the rubber necessary to modernize a military machine and keep it in proper working order.

Militarily, loss of the Malay Peninsula to the Communists and the near-Communists such as Sukarno would place Australia and New Zealand in grave danger of invasion. The Philippines would find itself alone and outflanked, surrounded in a hostile world of Red infiltration and terror tactics.

Because of its exposed position, our main line of defense in the Pacific would be forced to fall back thousands of miles to Hawaii.

It is for these reasons that our Nation cannot vacillate now. We must make it abundantly clear to the world that we realize the importance of this area to our future and to that of the free world.

It is for these reasons that we applaud the actions of our President in meeting this threat quickly and decisively. It is for this reason that the Congress of the United States, in this joint resolution, must stand behind the President and demonstrate our determination to stand up for freedom and stop aggression wherever we find it.

We have been called a paper tiger by the leaders of Red China, a tiger without real substance. By our actions in answer to provocation earlier this week, we have shown unmistakably in the only language the Communists seem to comprehend, that we decidedly have teeth and we know how to use them.

On June 10 while the House of Representatives was considering the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, I offered an amendment to the bill to express the sense of Congress that the President should use every means to secure the borders of South Vietnam from infiltration and stating our commitment to freedom for the people of South Vietnam and southeast Asia.

That resolution was not adopted at the time of the deliberations on the foreign aid bill some 8 weeks ago. However, the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, promised that this resolution would be considered by the committee as separate legislation.

At the time of our deliberations on the foreign aid bill in June, none of us could have foreseen the events which have caused our consideration of this joint resolution today.

Those of us who were anxious for inclusion of a statement of the sense of Congress on the Far East situation in the

foreign aid bill are extremely pleased to support this joint resolution we are considering today.

I, for one, feel that such an expression of determination, coupled with the swift and fitting response the United States has taken to this act of unwarranted aggression, will warn our enemies that we do not intend to drop our guard just because this happens to be an election year.

No matter what our political differences, no matter how we see issues and answers, America is united in its determination to keep its word, to support freedom, and to shoulder its responsibilities.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge prompt and unanimous adoption of the resolution now before the House. I applaud the bipartisan expression of support of President Johnson. This is how it should be. We must not let politics divide us when our country's national interest and security are at stake.

For the past 10 years, the peace in southeast Asia has been jeopardized and repeatedly violated by the persistent efforts of the Communist powers to infiltrate, subvert, and overthrow the legitimate governments of the free nations of that area of the world.

The aggressive and expansionist policies of the Asian Communist powers have visited untold suffering, misery, and death upon thousands of people whose only desire has been to live in peace, to improve their material well-being, and to build a better world for their children.

Neither the aged, the women, nor children have been spared by the Communist campaign of terror and drive to dominate southeast Asia.

Further, beginning this month, the Communist campaign has moved into a new dimension:

No longer satisfied with systematic subversion and guerrilla warfare which they have been waging in South Vietnam—

No longer satisfied with partial invasion of Laos in clear violation of the 1962 Geneva accords—

No longer satisfied with the progressive encirclement and penetration of Thailand and Cambodia—

It appears the Communist powers of Asia have decided to write a new chapter in their long campaign of military aggression and flouting of international law.

Without provocation—without justification of any kind—they have launched successive attacks on the naval vessels of the United States moving through international waters of the Gulf of Tonkin.

The sequence of events of the past few days is clear.

On August 2, the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* was attacked by North Vietnamese torpedo boats and, firing in self-defense, the *Maddox* drove off the attackers.

The U.S. Government, responding immediately to this unprovoked attack, warned the Hanoi regime that any further military attacks on American forces

August 7

would entail "grave consequences" for the Communists.

In spite of this warning, only 2 days later—on August 4—U.S. destroyers, the *Maddox* and the *C. Turner Joy*, were again attacked by North Vietnamese torpedo boats in international waters. The attack lasted 2 hours. It constituted, without a shadow of a doubt, an act of overt military aggression.

The response of the United States to this second attack was again immediate and necessary: President Johnson ordered air strikes against the North Vietnamese torpedo boats and their supporting facilities on the coast of North Vietnam. These attacks were carried out promptly.

The action on the part of the United States is clear and is notable on several accounts—and we must keep them clearly in mind:

It was justified.

It was necessary.

It was immediate.

And finally—and very importantly—it showed tremendous restraint on the part of a great power in responding to a provocation of a small power.

The United States acted—and acted without hesitation—but also in a manner proportionate to the provocation.

The action of the United States was consistent with our obligations to our friends and allies in southeast Asia—with article 51 of the United Nations Charter—and with our own vital interests in that region of the world. As chairman of the subcommittee which has dealt with legislation affecting this area for many years, I have no hesitation—no doubts—in making this statement.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House—a resolution which was approved without a dissenting vote by the Committee on Foreign Affairs—endorses the action of President Johnson in responding promptly, effectively and with moderation to the unprovoked attack by the North Vietnamese torpedo boats upon our naval vessels. The resolution further expresses the support of the Congress for the determination of the President to take such action as may be necessary, now and in the future, to restrain or repel Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

I believe that prompt and unanimous adoption of this resolution by the House of Representatives is warranted and necessary.

For the past 10 years, we have been actively and increasingly engaged in the pursuit of peace in southeast Asia, as we have been for much longer in other parts of the world.

We have attempted through moral suasion, through economic and military assistance, and now through the direct use of power in the defense of our own forces to promote the establishment and maintenance of viable and independent states, free to pursue their own national destinies, secure from interference from any quarter.

We have endeavored to support and strengthen the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 which have these very objectives.

And we are determined to continue in the pursuit of these goals.

Our determination in this respect must be made clear to all.

We seek no territorial gain—nor any spheres of influence in southeast Asia—but we are determined to resist with power appropriate to the occasion, any attempt on the part of the Communist regimes of Asia to enslave these free countries.

The measure before the House expresses our resolve. Its meaning should be clear to all. Its adoption by the House should put to rest any doubts about our national will and determination on this issue.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I again urge the House to give prompt and unanimous approval to the resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, our domestic press as well as much of the responsible press of the world supports President Johnson's decision. At this point I ask unanimous consent to include several editorials commenting on the President's order of retaliation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorials referred to are as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Aug. 5, 1964]

Hour of Risk

The Nation will support its President in his decision to make a "positive reply" to North Vietnamese naval strikes by attacking Vietnamese gunboats and supporting shore facilities. As Commander in Chief, the President is responsible for the national security, and his must be the decision when that security is at stake.

It was reassuring to have President Johnson emphasize in his broadcast statement to the Nation that "we seek no wider war," that our response "will be limited and fitting."

The purpose of the North Vietnamese attacks on our destroyers is unclear. Certainly no navy consisting of 16 gunboats, even speedy gunboats of relatively modern design, could hope to have much effect against the mighty 7th Fleet. It could do little more than sting a few vessels, and the Navy says that it failed to even do that. Why, then, stir up a hornet's nest? Major North Vietnamese cities, even Hanoi, the capital, are within easy striking distance of our carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin. One of the handicaps which the United States has voluntarily assumed in aiding South Vietnam to resist aggression has been to leash its naval forces in the area. Yet the Navy has placed an important role in patrolling the major Chinese-North Vietnam supply route in the Tonkin Gulf.

It may be that the North Vietnamese, with the backing of Communist China, were testing the American will. If so, they have their answer.

This period following our swift reaction is one of risk and danger, of course. Communist China is undoubtedly in a state of soul searching. Will it openly join the war in Vietnam now that attack has been made on North Vietnam? What of the Soviet Union, pledged to help any Communist nation which is attacked—a pledge now under a shadow because of the Sino-Soviet ideological split which has been tearing the Communist world apart.

This is no Korea, where the Chinese could literally choke a narrow peninsula with hordes of men. This is southeast Asia, a wide and

difficult terrain not suited for mass action. Chinese military equipment is outmoded and lacking in parts. Chinese people are hungry. They lack oil and other material vital to modern military action. Still, China is a proud nation, harassed on many sides. It could choose to act. The risk is there.

There is some danger that this country may tend to overreact to North Vietnamese stings because of our political situation. President Johnson has been under attack for what opponents call a no-win policy in southeast Asia. He has been unwisely urged to escalate the war. Under such circumstances a President can be handicapped in making vital decisions.

President Johnson will need courage and patience and restraint to keep the Nation from the wider war that he—and all men who realize what modern war is—wish to avoid. Firmness in the right, as the President says, "is indispensable today for peace." Measured firmness—and "its mission is peace."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Aug. 7, 1964]

RESOLUTION IN CRISIS

The gathering together of the Nation's resources at times of grave crisis is admirably reflected in the dispatch with which Congress has moved to associate itself with President Johnson's directives in southeast Asia. The joint resolution authorizing the Chief Executive to take "all necessary measures" to repel attack and to extend assistance in the defense of allies throughout southeast Asia is a broad expression of confidence, but its chief usefulness is not as a grant of power. Its primary purpose is to demonstrate to enemies who may yet be considering provocative excursions that the United States, in full unity, is wholly determined to yield neither principle nor territory to ruthless aggressors.

The resolution is not the only earnest of American intent. While the House and Senate deliberated yesterday, reinforcing ships and planes were moving into position to meet new thrusts—whether they come again from North Vietnam or openly from Red China. If the fighting spreads in the wake of the retaliatory strike against Hanoi, however, it will not be by American choice. That blow was a one-time operation, not to be repeated unless there are new forays from the other side. Subsequent military deployment has been solely a defensive precaution.

While opposing forces stand tensely in border zones, watching carefully for ominous motion, the United Nations Security Council is going ahead with plans to hear from the two Vietnams. If open conflict can be avoided before the talking starts, some of the heat may be taken out of the crisis. If North Vietnam can make any defense of the attacks on American ships, the world would like to hear it. The United States will not wait idly for an explanation which may never come. Until the threat of aggression has receded the ramparts will be manned, and the soldier or airman at the most distant outpost has the support of his Government and his people. That is what the congressional resolution tells the world.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Aug. 5, 1964]

PRESIDENT ORDERS RETALIATION

The positive and direct action ordered by President Johnson against the North Vietnamese ports sheltering Communist PT boats was the only honorable course open. There was no other way if the Communists were to know for a certainty that this Nation would retaliate forcibly and with telling effect any unprovoked hostile action.

President Johnson went to the Nation over the television and radio networks shortly

before midnight Tuesday and dramatically announced that air action was being executed against the gunboats of North Vietnam which had attacked U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin.

The President warned that repeated acts of violence against the Armed Forces of the United States must be met not only with alert defense but with positive reply. The Nation takes pride in the strong stand taken by the President, one that will serve as a warning to the Communist nations.

The President, and his advisers, fully realize that this retaliatory move might spark armed reaction from China. But he emphasized that the air strike, undertaken by U.S. Navy planes in a series of attacks against the Red craft and their shore facilities, will be, for the present, limited and fitting.

Whether the action taken by the United States will result in any extended armed conflict rests entirely on Red China and the North Vietnamese. They hold the key to the situation, a situation that could easily have far-reaching effects if they decide to increase their hostilities.

For all intents and purposes President Johnson does not plan to order any additional strikes unless there is provocation by the Communists. And then such retaliatory measures will come effectively and in force.

The next few days will be of critical importance as Red China, apparently surprised at the President's sudden retaliatory decision, comes to a decision. Peiping must know that this United States means business in making its pledge to defend the security of southeast Asia as well as American ships in international waters.

China is not in a position, economically or militarily, to let the situation get out of hand and become involved in a war. Peiping has a huge military machine, as far as manpower is concerned, but any sustained campaign is out of the question. It must be kept in mind that the country lacks food and gasoline supplies and cannot rely on any assistance from Moscow due to their ideological dispute which has brought about a widening breach between the two Communist countries.

President Johnson's decision drew commendation throughout the Nation and has received bipartisan endorsement in high political circles. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the Republican Presidential nominee, is standing solidly behind the President's action. The Senator has long advocated a sterner U.S. policy toward Communist forces in North Vietnam and throughout the world.

Before making his statement to the Nation the President took the Senator into his confidence and immediately received wholehearted approval. Both were in agreement that this Nation cannot allow the American flag to be shot at anywhere on earth if we are to retain our respect and prestige. Decisive action could not be delayed regardless of whether this is election year.

The United States is powerful in the Far East. It is in a position to meet all emergencies which might arise. The military strength of 225,000 men, thousands of planes and 125 ships of the 7th Fleet, with others nearby, should prove a deterrent to Red China.

President Johnson, in meeting the challenge posed by the Reds, acted on the principle that strong and effective action would prevent the crisis from developing into a full-scale war.

In closing his address to the American people he remarked: "Firmness in the right is indispensable today for peace. That firmness will always be measured. Its mission is peace." It was only through such firmness displayed by the late President John F. Kennedy that a nuclear war with Russia over Cuba was avoided 2 years ago.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution neither gives nor takes from the President any authority already delegated to him to act in an emergency or crisis.

Neither is it a declaration of war.

It is in the nature of an after-the-fact sense resolution endorsing an action already taken by the President. For whatever value it may have as an expression of unity in this emergency, I will support the resolution.

However, I am sick and tired of approving resolutions which try to imply that the United Nations has provided more than token opposition to the halting of the Communist world conspiracy.

It is Americans and Vietnamese who are fighting and dying in Vietnam. Apparently that polyglot organization, known as the United Nations, could care less about what happens in southeast Asia.

Yesterday, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I urged that the word "Constitution," as used in the resolution, be properly identified as the "Constitution of the United States." That suggestion was rejected.

I am pleased that the chairman of the committee will offer an amendment today to insert the necessary words.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] for his very cogent analysis of the situation. I share his concern. Many of us are glad to see the President take the action in Vietnam which he did. There are some pertinent questions to ask, however.

Does this really represent a policy switch from the no-win, vacillating course of events which our State Department has followed? While I hope it has, I must say I am indeed apprehensive. We have seen boldness and resolve fritter away into indecision and appeasement in Berlin, Cuba, and in Laos. In each case, a strong pronouncement was made by the Chief Executive and in each case, the performance was woefully lacking in resolve. We will have to wait and see. I certainly hope that President Johnson learns from the failures of the past 3 years that we cannot appease the Communists.

Unfortunately, there are many circumstances which indicate that there were political implications to the Vietnam action. Secretary MacNamara has admitted that the President went on television and announced the attack on the North Vietnamese PT boats was in progress 1 hour and 40 minutes before the attack actually started. American

boys should not be sacrificed thusly and no error should thus jeopardize them whether prime TV time is at stake or not.

Further, I feel that it is unfortunate that any reference at all is made in this resolution to the United Nations. It has demonstrated that it is ineffective in any positive policy which challenges the Communists at any place in the world. It has proved a good debating forum but cannot be counted on in any crisis or confrontation with the Moscow-oriented bloc.

One cannot help but think that election year politics has played a part in this decision. Castro attacks on American shipping last year brought no such response. American boys have been killed by hit-and-run guerrilla action which originated in North Vietnam without any positive response. It certainly cannot be rationalized that an attack on a destroyer is important but the death of scores of our boys and hundreds of casualties are unimportant. Unless there has been a total change of policy or election year politics had something to do with the decision, the President's action makes little sense, considering the lack of strong response by our military to similar land attacks made in the past. The State Department has hamstrung our military as a part of their unannounced disarmament policy just as they agreed to remove missiles from Turkey as a concession during the Cuban confrontation of October 1962. Whatever the reason, Americans greet this strong action with a fervent hope that the State Department appeasers will see that the American people support firm and forthright action. The backdown of the Kennedy administration following a similar resolution on the Cuban crisis should not be repeated.

Parenthetically, one cannot help but consider some of the charges from the left to date and the accusations hurled at the Republican presidential nominee. Had he advocated such an action and had the President not instituted his forthright retaliatory attack, can you not imagine what the Lippmanns, Drummonds, and the bleeding hearts of the left would have been saying? Warmonger, shoot from the hip, impulsive, and so forth. I can hear it now.

In the hopes, Mr. Speaker, that we are witnessing some backbone in the State Department, I apprehensively support this resolution and firmly back the President in this crisis.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution supporting the President's action in the current southeast Asian crisis reflects the unity of the American people in the face of Communist aggression in that area of the world.

Just as President Eisenhower and President Kennedy received bipartisan support during the foreign crises which occurred during their administrations, the Congress must now stand solidly behind President Johnson's decision to meet Communist fire with a firm and un-

mistakable response. There must be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that our people are determined to support whatever steps are necessary to safeguard our interests and those of the free world against Communist aggression.

I urge the immediate adoption of the pending resolution.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in any hour of international crisis, the determination of the U.S. Government and its people to maintain the freedom of our own land and strive for the freedom of all people must be dramatically reaffirmed, and, therefore, I join in support of this resolution.

However, I feel it practical to construct a public record here this afternoon re-emphasizing two important points often overlooked. The first is the importance of the Congress, the legislative branch, in the proper direction and implementation of foreign affairs. We have too often been told that foreign affairs is the exclusive realm of the Executive, and in the last 3½ years we have been expected to rubberstamp many dubious foreign policy decisions of the administration.

Nevertheless, at the present moment of crisis in southeast Asia, where our naval vessels, moving in international waters, were subject to unprovoked attack, the importance of this congressional resolution cannot be overestimated.

Therefore, I think it would be consistent that the effectiveness of the legislative branch be utilized in the continual conduct of foreign affairs, not just in resolution form in periodic crisis.

Second, may I point out that it was the sense of Congress in specifically providing increased funds for Vietnam that we were providing for a "win" policy rather than a "no win" or accommodation policies, which are clearly this administration's practices.

The determination of President Johnson to demonstrate our strength and to effectively retaliate against any unprovoked attack such as occurred earlier this week is supported by the public and the Congress in adopting this resolution is truly expressing overwhelming public opinion.

May I also point out, however, that the rapid and unopposed approval of the resolution by the House Foreign Affairs Committee was based substantially on testimony we received from Secretaries Rusk and McNamara. I certainly trust that time will demonstrate that this testimony was factual and thorough, and further trust that the policies of the administration will be readjusted and the Congress continually provided with up-to-date accurate reports on world events, rather than kept in the dark by any deliberate or well-intended policies of news suppression.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am as deeply concerned about the recent

events that have transpired in Vietnam—and all of their far-reaching implications—as any Member of this House. Today we are called upon to approve a resolution supporting the position the President has taken. I have no quarrel with what the President has done—really there was no alternative to some form of quick, decisive action such as was ordered, and I intend to support the resolution.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am very disturbed that as a member of the House Armed Services Committee I must run to the newsstand to find out what is going on in southeast Asia.

Yesterday both the Foreign Relations and the Armed Services Committees of the other body met jointly to consider this resolution. The House Armed Services Committee has had no briefings that I know of on the recent aggression in Vietnam and I have been told that none are planned at the present time.

Just last week I wrote to my distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee urging that our Vietnam hearings which began in early May, and have never been concluded, be resumed and that the committee be provided with regular briefings thereafter to keep abreast of the fast-moving events in that troubled area of the world. Two days ago the chairman wrote to advise me that he plans no briefings for members of the Armed Services Committee in connection with the current crisis in Vietnam. This is beyond my comprehension, for, as a Member of this House of Representatives and its Committee on Armed Services, I find that if I am to be informed on what is going on in the world today, I must do so on my own and am not even accorded the briefings that have been made available to the members of the press.

While I join in supporting the President's action—I wish I had more information about what is happening in Vietnam today and had a reliable source of intelligence beyond the newsstand.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

(Mr. FOREMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution expressing the will and the determination of this country to protect freedom against Communist aggressors. Certainly, most Americans everywhere favored the President's military action taken in retaliation to the provocative action by the Communists off the coast of Vietnam.

However, I am concerned, and I do not necessarily endorse the action that was outlined on the front page of the Washington Post this morning surrounding this action and schedule of events in this grave matter.

The news article this morning stated that Secretary of Defense McNamara released a detailed summary yesterday afternoon of the U.S. air raids which showed that the initial attack on the North Vietnam bases did not take place until 1:15 a.m., eastern daylight time, Wednesday, a full hour and a half later after the President had announced that

air action was in operation. Less than 1 hour ago, I confirmed this report through Secretary McNamara's Pentagon office. We have heard an awful lot in these past few weeks about trigger happy, irresponsibility. I say to the House, What is this? What is this when we give an hour and a half notice of our attack upon the Communists? What kind of action is this? What kind of responsibility is it when the President of the United States appears on the television networks so that he can talk nationwide to the people to tell them one hour and a half ahead that our planes are coming in. Why, this is better notice to the enemy than they could get with an alert radar defense system.

Can this kind of nationwide television appearance and statement during prime viewing time be termed publicity-happy, political irresponsibility? Could such action as that be called "shooting from the lip"? The parents, the wives, and the families of the American boys that were killed in these airstrikes are going to be asking a very grave and penetrating question, "Would we have our son or husband or daddy if the Communists had not been warned an hour and a half ahead of time?" Yes, Mr. Speaker, Americans everywhere will ponder this question, and others, in the days and weeks ahead. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution expressing our willingness and determination to stand firm and strong against Communist aggressors. I have been calling and pleading and working for such an expression and policy since the beginning of this administration. I am thankful that the administration has finally recognized that extreme measures in the defense of American lives and naval ships is no vice.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the views which have already been expressed in support of the very fine and positive action which was taken by the President in response to repeated Communist provocation in the Tonkin Gulf, and in support of the pending Vietnam resolution.

Unquestionably, the President acted wisely in the interest and hope of preventing an expansion of the conflict. It is essential that we too act wisely today by giving this resolution overwhelming support. I hope it will be unanimous.

This resolution makes it unmistakably clear to all the world, especially to both the Hanoi and Peiping regimes, that this country is no "paper tiger" and that our normal tolerance and patience should never be misunderstood.

Mr. Speaker, the President had no honorable alternative for our country except to retaliate, but he did it with restraint. In an extremely critical and dangerous situation, he acted with a cool head and a steady hand.

The resolution we are now discussing says in no uncertain language that the American people are solidly behind our President in his determination to restrain or repel Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

1964

It expresses the approval and support of this Congress of such action as the President, both now, and hereafter, may find necessary in defense of peace and freedom in southeast Asia.

The facts are clear. The action taken was firm and positive and limited and measured. It was an act of self-defense. Let us hope that our own restraint will be an example to all who would war against us, but let us be prepared in the event our example is not followed.

Let us hope the attacks have ended, but let us prepare to respond with even more forceful retaliation, if such becomes necessary. In fact, let us leave no stone unturned in expediting our immediate readiness to do whatever may become necessary to restrain or repel the dogs of war.

Let us also properly evaluate this crisis in its global context in which seemingly hopeful tendencies toward peace will not lull us into any illusions about the aggressive designs of North Vietnam and its Chinese Communist sponsor.

Above everything, let us make as clear as humanly possible our hopes and aspirations for peace and also our determination to fight, if need be, with whatever force may prove necessary, to protect and defend our rights and our freedom and the rights and freedom of our friends.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an appropriate and necessary one, even though from a legal viewpoint it may not add too greatly, if at all, to the powers that the President has. Nevertheless, under the circumstances, where this attack was a surprise attack, and opportunity for the President to gain the support of the Congress and of the country was not possible, this reference to the Congress is a desirable thing. It gives added sanction and support to the President at a critical time in the vital decision which he has made as well as the choices which may well lie ahead for him.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned that this was a surprise attack. Is not the record also clear that our aircraft caught the North Vietnamese completely by surprise; and any indication to this House that our flyers went in there against forewarned opposition is therefore totally and completely incorrect and a grave disservice to the country and to our great Navy?

Mr. MONAGAN. Of course, that is true. It is also true that there was no opportunity, as has been suggested, for the President to confer with the Congress or with anybody else and this is the first chance we have had to show that we support his action, as we do. I am sure this joint resolution will be voted unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and ask that the House also support it unanimously.

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

(Mr. BARRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in supporting the resolution I think we must first of all be aware of the consequences of the action we are about to take today. We must be constantly aware of the realization that the Chinese think of all nations to the south as imperialistic nations mainly because they are looking for an excuse to oppose them—the real reason being that they have been eyeing the rich rice paddies to the south for years and their constant harassment of their southern neighbors is an ever-continuing policy of landgrabbing. The nations to the south on the other hand fear the Chinese in the north, not because they are Communists, but because they are Chinese. This has gone on for hundreds and hundreds of years.

The consequences of U.S. action might be entirely different from something that we may expect, because the Chinese may not fully understand what we intend. Chinese retaliation depends on how our thoughts and actions are adjudged in Peiping. This could very well develop into a mass movement of troops into Laos, a move into Burma, or even a move into India. Any of these might be the response of the action taken by the U.S. Government. I point this out so that we may understand the consequence of the action that we are taking.

Nevertheless I uphold the action that we are talking. We have been struck and we should strike back.

It is obvious that these attacks by the North Vietnamese on the U.S. naval vessels are related directly to the persistent policy of aggression of the North Vietnamese Communist regime. They were not isolated events, but part of a continuing drive to control and eventually dominate southeast Asia.

I am satisfied, by the statements presented to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk, that the attacks occurred in international waters, that they were unprovoked by the United States, and that they were deliberate attempts of aggression to destroy our naval vessels. These facts compel the United States to respond with firm military action. Not to contain this threat is to encourage further military attacks and continued acts of subversion and encroachment in southeast Asia.

The purpose of this resolution is to declare U.S. determination to assist the free nations of southeast Asia to defend themselves against Communist aggression. In so doing, this statement acts as a deterrent so our intentions become fully understood by all concerned.

The United States has no territorial ambitions—we seek only peace and security for the peoples of Vietnam. Our immediate intent is one to assist in defense of their freedom and independence.

We ask only that Peiping and Hanoi honor the Geneva accords of 1954 and the Geneva agreements of 1962 by ceasing their attacks of aggression and subversion on the Asian Continent.

The determination of the United States must be declared so there is no doubt about our response. This was declared in the Formosa resolution of 1955 authorizing the President "to employ the Armed Forces of the United States," the Middle East resolution of 1957 stating the United States was "prepared to use Armed Forces," and the Cuban resolution of 1962 declaring that the United States is "determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms" Cuban aggression in any part of the hemisphere.

With these precedents in mind, it is vitally important to the security of the entire free world, as well as southeast Asia, that the U.S. intent be pronounced, unanimously, once more.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I am confident it will be passed with overwhelming, if not unanimous, support. I am confident too that if we are attacked again, we will respond with similar dispatch and effectiveness.

Only a policy based on strength and firmness will prevent war and insure peace. We in America want peace in our time and for all time. We recognize that policies of weakness and indecision are the historical catalysts that most surely lead to major all-out war. I sincerely hope that our recent action and the passage of this resolution promise a new policy and a new direction in our dealings with the Communist in southeast Asia.

I am not confident that it does. I am fearful that it does not signal a fundamental change in American policy although I wish it were otherwise, for we seek peace in this world.

The plain fact is that this naval action at sea and our response to it has not removed or lessened or really changed the critical situation we continue to face on land in South Vietnam and other parts of southeast Asia.

The war in Vietnam goes on. We still face a grim choice. We have struck at the north. But if our President meant what he said about not seeking to widen the war, then our single reaction does not represent a lasting change in policy but rather a "measured response" to a special circumstance.

In this sea action, Mr. Speaker, we have followed the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of selective retaliation by responding on a level greater and more costly to the enemy than his provocative but unprovoked action was to us. For this, I commend the President.

But, I repeat, the land war remains. And we still have a policy to develop. We still must decide whether to follow the Gaullist proposal of withdrawal by

August 7

neutralization or whether to stiffen our commitment by resolving to take whatever steps are necessary to win the war in that beleaguered area within a reasonable period of time.

In the wake of this firmness—which, in the interest of peace, I hope will not be short-lived—let us make that decision. We must develop and announce to our friends as well as to the Communists what our policy in southeast Asia is as we face the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include certain editorials.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, although some of my distinguished colleagues who have preceded me in this discussion have expressed doubts and fears about the strength and determination of this country, I want to make it clear that I have no lack of confidence in President Johnson; I have no lack of confidence in our military forces; I have no lack of confidence in our policy; and I have no lack of confidence in the American people's determination to fight for the protection of freedom wherever and whenever it is necessary to do so. The resolution before us expresses that determination and our confidence in President Johnson's leadership in time of grave crisis.

Mr. Speaker, this prompt and firm action by the President of the United States supported in this resolution demonstrates to foe and friend the unity of our people behind President Johnson's strong and measured leadership in the protection of our country against Communist aggression.

President Johnson's prompt military action should put to rest any erroneous ideas that the Communists or others may have that the United States has a "no win policy"; or that the United States is a "paper tiger." President Johnson's action also corrects any Communist idea that this administration or this country is "soft on communism."

President Johnson's action supported by this resolution makes it crystal clear that in today's struggle the Communists will not find a haven behind some arbitrary geographic line where they can maintain a base of operation for their aggressive acts. This warning by the United States should not go unnoticed or unheeded.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly review what this resolution does not do.

This resolution does not set a precedent. This House and the Congress of the United States took action similar to that requested today in the Formosa and Middle East crises when requested by President Eisenhower and also took similar action when requested by President Kennedy in the Cuba crisis.

This resolution is not a declaration of war. The language of the resolution makes that clear as does the legislative history. Therefore this resolution in no way impinges on the prerogative of the Congress to declare war. Furthermore, no one here today has advocated a dec-

laration of war. Any Member who feels that the action supported and authorized in this resolution is not strong enough or does not go far enough can at any time introduce under his own name a resolution declaring war. No Member on either side of the aisle has done so to my knowledge, and I respectfully submit that in view of President Johnson's action such a resolution of war is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker the pending resolution does, however, ratify and support the military action recently ordered and taken by President Johnson to respond to the unprovoked Communist armed attacks against the U.S. Navy while in international waters. The resolution also authorizes President Johnson to take such military action in the future if necessary to protect U.S. military forces against further Communist attack.

The United States is a great maritime and naval power. Our right, recognized under international law, to be on the high seas and international waters free from any kind of attack is basic to the maintenance of our freedom. We will make it clear in passing this resolution that Americans are united behind the need for the use of our military force to protect and defend this basic freedom.

This resolution also supports the policy of the United States which we have taken to preserve freedom in southeast Asia. It authorizes President Johnson to take any future action, including the use of our military force, to assist, on request, any country in southeast Asia which is within the purview of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty.

We make no change in our policy that the United States can best obtain and maintain peace and expand freedom by providing economic, military, and political support to those countries and people who need that help to maintain their independence and expand their freedoms. This resolution gives support to this long-standing U.S. commitment.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the unity and desire of the American people to support President Johnson in his actions to protect the United States and fight for freedom.

Indicative of the broad public support which President Johnson has for his policies, I call attention to the following newspaper editorials which are representative of the thinking of American citizens on this matter:

[From the Miami Herald, Aug. 6, 1964]

IN CRISIS, A FIRM NATION

As swift as a speeding torpedo from a PT boat, the situation in Vietnam has blossomed into full-scale crisis.

American blood has been shed in the first U.S. military action since the Korean war that was not purely defensive.

There can be no partisanship in full support of President Johnson's response to the repeated provocation—a response that he called fitting in his solemn report to the Nation.

Why we are so deeply involved in Vietnam may have been a political issue before—and may be again—but not while the Nation's defenders stand alert in danger.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's approval of the President's course and the rapid move by Congress to declare the national purpose are assurances of unity. Our quick consultation with the United Nations and our allies in

wide-ranging pacts are steps to include all peaceful peoples.

The world watched this showdown approach slowly, inevitably, since the United States responded to South Vietnam's pleas for help in 1957. Under the Geneva Agreement which guaranteed the security of partitioned Vietnam, we drew the line there against the Communist takeover.

Repeatedly we announced our resistance to Communist aggression against helpless peoples and hoped that these expressions of determination would be deterrent enough.

Even when the North Vietnamese attacked the destroyer *Maddox* in international waters Sunday our reaction was confined to repulse, not pursuit. This was coupled with a clear warning that the overt act must not be repeated.

The Vietnamese took up the challenge. Our response is now in the record. It included an air strike on supply bases in North Vietnam, with heavy damage.

We have now taken the step that has been debated for months. The fighting in South Vietnam has been extended.

The consequences no one can now foresee but we cannot back away.

The North Vietnamese and their Red Chinese mentors still have the choice. They may accept the President's statement that "there can be no peace by aggression and no immunity from reply." If they do not, and if the Red Chinese practice their violent preachings, the danger is acute.

Our rapid buildup of naval and air strength and the dispatch of reinforcements to the sizable forces already in southeast Asia are the signs of determination the country has long awaited.

We stand with the President that firmness in the right is indispensable today for peace. Let any who doubt this accept the responsibility for their acts.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 5, 1964]

THE PRESIDENT RESPONDS

The President speaks for the country and for the free world in his comment on and reaction to North Vietnamese aggression in the Bay of Tonkin. Party differences at home disappear and ranks close. The procedure to date has been graduated correctly in line with challenge and provocation: defensive reply to the first attack, then, under explicit Presidential orders, action not merely to defend but to destroy in the second attack, and now affirmative, if limited thrusts at the facilities from which the attacks were launched. In comparable alignment with the constitutional proprieties, the congressional leaders are in consultation and the National Legislature takes up its role in the national response.

That response will of course mount or vary as the situation unfolds. The details of the adversary's intentions are not yet clear but his general strategy has been encountered before and so is not unfamiliar. He probes and pushes, but he recognizes limits when they are made manifest. This was demonstrated in Korea in 1950 and in Cuba in 1962. Since North Vietnam hardly acts alone, much will depend on the Chinese and Russian judgment of American intentions. Here the West may learn something of the true state of relations between the two quarreling Communist giants. But the lesson of Korea and of Cuba was that rigorous response moderates provocation. The President has ordered rigorous response and the country will hope and pray that further rigor is not needed.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1964]

WIDER WAR

On July 24, President Johnson said that "the United States seeks no wider war" in Vietnam, but he warned that "provocation could force a response." That provocation—twice repeated—now has brought a response

that has been, in the President's words, "limited and fitting." Whether this ends the incident now is up to North Vietnam and to Communist China. The United States plans no further military strikes if there are no further Communist attacks. President Johnson has made it clear that "we still want no wider war."

Whether or not the confrontation stops there, the crisis in southeast Asia has been altered in fundamental ways—all involving great uncertainties and even greater dangers.

The United States has become a direct combatant on a significant scale, even if only briefly. The sword, once drawn in anger, will tend to be unsheathed more easily in the future.

Congressional authority for future military action will, in effect, be delegated to the President by the joint resolution scheduled to be voted today. The President has rightly asked that the resolution express a determination that all necessary measures be taken.

The concept of a Communist "privileged sanctuary" heeded hitherto both in Korea and Indochina, has been breached. The circumstances under which North Vietnam may be struck again remain undefined. But the rules of the war have undergone a basic change—a change that applies to Communist China as well as to Hanoi. President Johnson was clearly addressing Peiping when he warned "any who may be tempted to support—or to widen—the present aggression" that "there can be no peace by aggression and no immunity from reply."

Hanoi's sea patrol fleet largely has been wiped out and, lacking an air force, North Vietnam has been shown to be virtually open to hostile air attack. Hanoi's willing allies in Peiping are now under pressure to provide new means for sea and air protection—and even, perhaps, to intervene directly. Hanoi's reluctant allies in Moscow are under pressure, as yesterday's Soviet statement showed, to demonstrate their backing for North Vietnam before world Communist opinion.

Ranks have been closed in the United States with Senator GOLDWATER's open support for administration action. If Hanoi's attacks were an attempt to exploit political and racial division in the United States, the American reaction has proved this futile. Vietnam, in fact, has been taken out of the presidential campaign for the moment. The attempt to keep it out, by retaining Republican support, means that President Johnson henceforth will find firmness politically easier to emphasize than restraint.

American reluctance to go to an Indochina peace conference, as urged by President de Gaulle, is strongly reinforced. If Hanoi's purpose was to force such a conference, it could not have been more poorly advised.

These are some of the political and military realities after the Tonkin Gulf exchange. The lines have hardened. A highly dangerous period has opened. It is a time that calls for coolness, as well as determination, for restraint as well as firmness.

We still have no real idea of what prompted the North Vietnamese to launch their potentially suicidal adventure. The Nation's united confidence in its Chief Executive is vital. No one else can play the hand. That confidence will be best maintained by a continued adherence to the principles the President himself has enunciated of firmness but a firmness that will always be measured—a firmness whose mission is peace.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 7, 1964]

DEMOCRACY'S RESPONSE

Congress is responding with commendable promptness and with an almost unanimous voice to President Johnson's request for support in the southeast Asian crisis. The Pres-

ident consulted the leaders of both Houses and then asked for a supporting resolution not only because he felt the necessity for congressional approval of what is being done, but also because he wished to demonstrate before the world the unity of the American people in resisting Communist aggression. That unity has been demonstrated despite the reckless and querulous dissent of Senator MORSE.

There is no substance in Senator MORSE's charge that the resolution amounts to a "pre-dated declaration of war." On the contrary, it reaffirms the long-standing policy of the United States of aiding the states covered by the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty in the protection of their freedom as a contribution to international peace. It pledges military action only to resist aggression against American forces in that area. Of course, the President has authority to respond to attacks upon American forces without any approval in advance by Congress. So the resolution means only a recommitment of the Nation to the policy it has been following—an almost unanimous recommitment in the face of the inexplicable North Vietnamese challenge.

This means of reasserting the national will, far short of a declaration of war, follows sound precedents set in other crises. President Johnson noted in his message to Congress that similar resolutions had been passed at the request of President Eisenhower in connection with the threat to Formosa in 1955 and the threat to the Middle East in 1957. The same course was followed in 1962 at the request of President Kennedy to meet the missile threat in Cuba. None of these emergencies led to war. Rather, the firm action that this country took interrupted Communist maneuvers that might otherwise have led to war.

Congress ought to be very pleased with the now firm establishment of this mechanism for meeting an emergency with a united front. Reliance solely upon the power of Congress to declare war as a last resort would not be appropriate in these days of repeated crises short of war. A resolution of support for the Executive arm in meeting an emergency has all the virtue of rallying national strength behind a firm policy—without taking the calamitous step of war in this nuclear age. We surmise that the almost unanimous sentiment behind this resolution on Capitol Hill reflects appreciation for the President's sharing of responsibility as well as support for the tough punishment for aggression that he initiated.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 7, 1964]

COMMUNISM'S CHOICE

Time will doubtless improve on speculation's answer to the question of why Communist forces fired at the American Navy and how they will respond to the American hits on their soil. In the interim, we can be sure only that the next step is up to Hanoi and Peiping, that the decision is even more critical for them than for us, and that not only the conflict in Indochina but the power outlook in the Far East is at stake.

The sequence since Sunday is of a kind which forces those touched by it to define and declare themselves by their reactions. Hanoi has shown outrage but it is unable alone to match its feeling with action. Peiping, going further, has added an ambiguous pledge of solidarity which does not particularize the conditions that would require it to take a designated act. Moscow, caught off guard, has huffed disingenuously as though snorts would remove its embarrassing pinch between comradeship and self-interest. The lack of similarity between these Communist reactions is as striking as the lack of specificity.

The operational issue lies at the intersection of three streams of reality: the Sino-

Soviet dispute, East-West relations, and war or peace. The issue is the danger of confrontation with free-world power. The Soviets feel that the danger is so great as to require avoidance; the Chinese, not so great as to preclude struggle for desired goals. The Soviets fear that a small conflict involving a great power could become a big one, with universally disastrous results. The Chinese scoff at the dangers of such escalation. From the American viewpoint, the difference is that between manageable trouble and open-ended war.

From the spectrum of choices available to them, the Communists must now select those that satisfy the conflicting demands of prudence and pride. They have not been militarily rash in the past, with the crucial and upsetting exception of the torpedo forays in the Tonkin Gulf. Having answered those attacks in full measure, the United States must now hope to draw the conflict into diplomatic outlets, even while it prepares to meet further military challenges in Indochina.

A debate in the United Nations would be a bruising one, particularly if a representative of North Vietnam took part. It would expose the United States to a propagandistic onslaught on all its Indochina policies and would produce a bewildering array of information, half-truths, and falsifications about events there. However, a country in the position of answering aggression need have no scruples about upholding its case in an international forum.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1964]
MOSCOW'S REACTION

The Soviet Union employed some well-worn language yesterday to denounce the United States for its retaliatory strike at North Vietnam. But, fortunately for the peace of the world, Russian actions were far less militant than the tired Russian words.

The most important point, of course, is that Moscow took no direct military step to involve itself in the immediate area of tension. And in the United Nations, after its initial efforts to get the Security Council meeting postponed, the denunciation of alleged American aggression was followed by nothing stronger than a Soviet resolution to have the Council ask North Vietnam to supply information and to send a representative to participate in the debate. Peiping's own attempt to explain the air strike as an American election maneuver suggests the Chinese themselves are having some cautious second thoughts.

Moscow evidently finds itself between contradictory pressures in this new crisis. The men in Moscow are keenly aware of Peiping's charges that they have made a deal with the United States to betray Marxism-Leninism. Accordingly, they must have felt they had to charge Washington with aggression since any other course would give the Chinese too much useful ammunition.

But the Russians know well—and have complained many times about—Peiping's predilection for taking risks that could lead to war. Only last Monday Pravda printed a denunciation of a Chinese spokesman's statement to a Vienna newspaper that "war in southeast Asia would not be so bad." Pravda, the official organ of the Soviet Communist party, contrasted the Chinese eagerness for war with what it called the Soviet Union's "efforts not to permit the worsening of the conflict in this area of the planet."

On the basis of the statements Moscow has issued this past year, the Russians must fear that Peiping was fully capable of encouraging the North Vietnamese attacks on the American destroyers in the hope of provoking a wider conflict. But that wider conflict could hardly serve Soviet interests, and there is no reason to believe Russians are anxious to die and to see their historic

capital destroyed for the sake of Hanoi, or even Peiping.

It is tragic that the Russians, who have done so much to make the world aware of Communist China's aggressive intentions, lack the courage to draw the inevitable conclusion and to say so publicly when, as in this case, the world is faced with a concrete example of aggression performed in Peiping's zone of maximum influence.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan], in his commendation of the President's action in the Vietnamese crisis and to wholeheartedly concur in House Joint Resolution 1145 to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

The President's actions served notice in southeast Asia as well as everywhere in the world that America will keep and honor her commitments, and that a threat to any nation in that region is a threat to the United States.

Although there was bloodshed and military action, our basic purpose to maintain peace is reaffirmed as well as the fact that we have no military, political or territorial ambitions in this area, and, of course, the fact that this action was another phase in the overall power struggle for freedom everywhere. Once again we retaliated in the only language understood by an aggressor, and that is power, the power to destroy him if he persists in threatening our security.

I want to take this opportunity to salute our Navy, Air Force, and Army units for their successful actions which served further notice to the world that our technology is matched in excellence by our skill and determination to win.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the past few days an attack and a counterattack in the worldwide struggle between the forces of those who champion the cause of the independence of nations.

The retaliatory action ordered by the President of the United States following two unprovoked attacks upon U.S. naval units off the coast of southeast Asia has gained the overwhelming approval of the great majority of the American people. Following the first attack we followed established international procedure in directing a strong protest to the aggressor. Even as we were doing this the second attack was launched.

It then became our duty to show the world that while our main goal is to be an honorable friend we can also become a brave enemy if provocation demands. In the second incident provocation so demanded and we answered in kind.

Geographically this frontline of our defense of freedom is a vast distance from the American heartland. Yet in the measurement of time it is no farther away than our defensive frontiers in those long-ago days when our Nation was born. These attacks represent as real and as distinct a threat to our freedom as attacks made on our frontier outposts when our Nation was young.

Our ambitions for our friends on the other side of the world are not territorial, military, or political. Our ambitions are to adequately answer their call for assistance in maintaining the enemy of those ambitions we cannot yield without yielding our honor and the respect in which we are held by our friends. This we have never done. This we will never do.

The resolution now pending is an expression of American unity in this time of crisis. As Representatives of every American, this Congress is saying to the world that we are determined to defend liberty and to hold the torch of freedom high that every dark corner of this world might share in its light.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my distinguished colleagues in urging the adoption of the resolution (H.J. Res. 1145) before the House.

The reasons which argue this course are clear and persuasive.

We have tried with the resources at our command, with patience and perseverance, to advance the cause of peace and freedom in southeast Asia.

We have tried to discourage Communist aggression in that area at the conference table, and by assisting those free nations which have sought our help in resisting Communist designs on their territory.

We are determined to continue in these efforts.

At the same time, however, it should be clear to all—especially to the Communist powers of Asia—that the United States will not hesitate to take such additional measures as may be necessary to frustrate Communist expansionist ambitions. The Gulf of Tonkin surrounded as it is by Communist nations is international water. These Communist countries are ambitious to exclude it from this category and for that reason, it was necessary to prevent any precedent which might lead to this reasoning.

Our resolve on this point was evidenced in our prompt and vigorous response to the unprovoked North Vietnamese attacks upon our naval ships.

It is further evidenced in the resolution before the House today—a resolution which both endorses the action already taken by President Johnson and expresses the approval of the Congress for the President's determination to take such further steps as may be necessary to restrain and repel Communist aggression in that part of the world.

In the interest of the cause of peace, we should—we must approve this resolution promptly and overwhelmingly.

Anything less than that on our part can leave the Communist aggressors with the mistaken notion that our Nation is divided, and that our commitment to the cause of peace and freedom in southeast Asia is too fragile to withstand the test of repeatedly applied pressure.

Such a mistaken notion can lead to further miscalculations on their part—miscalculations which could engulf that region of the world in a conflict of escalating proportions.

A development of this kind would be completely contrary to our desires. It

would be a tragedy for the people of southeast Asia, for us, and for the cause of peace. We must, therefore, do all we can to prevent it by making our intentions crystal clear. The Congress has made its feelings known by adopting resolutions similar to the one before us today when the Communist Chinese threatened Formosa—when aggression appeared imminent in the Middle East—when the freedom of Berlin was threatened—and when the Soviets attempted to install offensive missiles in Cuba.

In each of those instances, prompt and positive action on the part of the Congress in support of our Chief Executive served to promote and strengthen world peace.

Our action today in adopting the resolution will have—I am certain—the same effect.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word about the relation of our military retaliation against North Vietnam to our commitments under the Charter of the United Nations.

I believe it is abundantly clear that the military actions ordered by President Johnson were fully consistent with the charter of that Organization.

Article 51 of the U.N. Charter reaffirms the right of every member nation, acting alone or in concert with its allies, to defend itself against an armed attack.

Article 51 further provides that measures taken in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council.

The actions of the United States during the past week were fully consistent with both of these requirements.

We responded to an armed attack. Our response was appropriate to the occasion. And we reported our action to the U.N. Security Council.

Mr. Speaker, during my service as the U.S. delegate to the United Nations 18th General Assembly last year, I made a lengthy speech before the 6th Committee on the subject of pacific settlement of international disputes—and what important role the United Nations has played, and can play in the future, in advancing peace through such procedures.

I firmly believe in the statements which I made at that time. We must endeavor at all times to prevent armed conflicts through pacific settlement of international disputes. We must endeavor to strengthen the ability of the United Nations Organization to serve that purpose.

At the same time, I fully realize that occasions may arise when instant action will be required, when the U.N. will be unable to intervene effectively, or when military power will have to be employed immediately to prevent aggression. The resolution before the House addresses itself to such occasions. I believe, therefore, that it is consistent with our support of the United Nations and should be adopted.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this resolution. However, I feel that some additional comments are needed at this time.

By voting for the resolution, I do not mean to indicate my unqualified ap-

proval of the administration's Vietnam policies during the past 3½ years. In the past I have been critical of certain administration southeast Asian policies and if the new policies do not measure up to the serious problems that will confront us I resolve the right to point such deficiencies.

The action taken by the administration in the last 4 days has been forthright and apparently effective. I approve.

The military results raise the legitimate question—similar U.S. military action affecting our own ground forces on prior occasions in Vietnam might have turned the tide our way much sooner. The United States in Vietnam is not winning now and has not been for the past months. I hope and trust what appears to be a new administration policy will bring victory for the people of Vietnam and the United States.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the resolution supporting the President's authority "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to end further aggression."

In fact, U.S. destroyers have been attacked by enemy gunfire in the Gulf of Tonkin, and have fired back.

So in supporting the resolution, I am somewhat in the position of the proprietor of the saloon whose bartender calls him on the intercom to ask:

"Is Casey good for a drink?"

"Has he had it?"

"He has."

"He is."

The alternatives open to this country in southeast Asia are all painful ones. The war against the Vietcong was not going well under the late Premier Diem, and it has not been going well under the Minh junta, or at present under General Khanh. To enlarge the war runs great risks of bringing in Red China, bogging down American ground forces on the Indochinese peninsula, and starting a major war which could end up as a nuclear one. At the opposite pole, to withdraw from South Vietnam, either openly or under the guise of a "neutralization" which failed to set up any adequate method of protecting the area, might well be to resign all of southeast Asia to Communist control.

So apparently we are destined to continue our present middleground approach as the least of three evils.

This middle-ground approach, Mr. Speaker, gives us an opportunity which we have not so far taken to attempt the one constructive solution to our woes in southeast Asia that I can see: invoke the presence of the United Nations. The United Nations Charter gives it responsibility for maintaining peace and security in the world. Drawing on peace force patterns established in the Middle East, the Congo, Cyprus, and elsewhere, we should go before the U.N. and request the establishment of such a force for South Vietnam, to patrol its borders, to restore tranquility, and to depart when peace comes and free elections can be held.

I would like to see the United States bring such a proposal before the U.N.

The United States could indicate its willingness to put its present forces in Vietnam under a U.N. command, hopefully supplemented by forces from other U.N. members, to stay as long as needed. Under chapter 7, article 42 of the United Nations Charter, if measures for peaceful settlement of a dispute prove inadequate, the Security Council may take whatever action is necessary to restore international peace and security. If the Security Council failed to act on the U.S. suggestion, the "uniting for peace" procedure worked out in 1950 at the time of the Korean crisis could be invoked, passing the matter to the General Assembly.

We cannot tell until we try whether we would have the necessary votes in the General Assembly to set up a U.N. presence in South Vietnam. But in any case, our moral position in South Vietnam would be vastly aided if we show a continuing disposition to internationalize the position in South Vietnam through the United Nations.

I am aware that U.N. Secretary General U Thant has blown more cold than hot on the idea of invoking the U.N. in the South Vietnam situation. Last March, Mr. Thant said that he saw no useful U.N. role for Vietnam. Last July 8 he called for a reconvening of the 14-nation Geneva Conference of 1954, with a U.N. peacekeeping mission to supervise any plan worked out by such a conference. Our Department of State did not respond to Mr. Thant's July 8 proposal. The Department tells me that since Mr. Thant's proposal was made at a press conference, and not formally, the United States has not felt it necessary to reply to it.

Yesterday Mr. Thant is quoted as saying:

For the moment, as I see it, the Security Council cannot be usefully involved in any settlement of the crisis in southeast Asia. * * * One of the parties concerned (North Vietnam) is not a member of the United Nations.

With all due respect to Mr. Thant, the fact that North Vietnam is not a member of the U.N. seems to me to have no bearing whatever on our invoking the U.N. which is equally equipped to take action against a member or nonmember.

I shall vote in favor of the resolution to support the President in resisting aggression. But I urge once again that we delay no longer in invoking the moral authority of the United Nations for the protection of the independence of southeast Asia.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support wholeheartedly both the language and the spirit of House Joint Resolution 1145, asserting firmly the approval of the Congress of all necessary measures by the President to prevent further aggression in southeast Asia.

The maintenance of peace and security in that remote area of the world has been threatened by armed attack upon units of our fleet, operating lawfully in international waters.

President Johnson has moved with determination to make effective use of our mighty Armed Forces to answer that threat, and he has used the only language which aggressors understand.

This resolution is not only an expression of congressional support for our President in this moment of crisis; it is also an affirmation to the world that our partisan political differences stop at the water's edge, and we stand as a united people whenever our flag and its defenders are attacked by an aggressor.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my vigorous and most earnest support for the resolution before us, and to join in the remarks of my distinguished colleagues. President Johnson has again demonstrated that the United States can use its enormous power with both prudence and restraint. There is no question that the unprovoked North Vietnamese attacks upon our naval units were blatant acts of aggression. There is no question that only a firm and quick response could have made clear our determination to defend our own and our allies' honor. But there is also no question that a rash and unreasoned reaction might, in dragging us into a catacyclism, have destroyed all we are struggling to defend.

I am somewhat disheartened, indeed, dismayed, by the failure of my colleagues to emphasize that the first principle of our foreign policy is still the preservation of peace, and our President has reiterated his and our commitment to this principle. Let us never accept that dark creed which finds in the certitude of war the only answer to our international problems. The people of the United States have more faith in the strength of our great ideals ever to adopt such a policy of desperation.

Yesterday's news was most encouraging, for our President has demonstrated to the world that he intends to utilize every available channel to stave off a threatened conflict. His talks with Secretary General U Thant, of the United Nations Organization, give rise to the hope that the peacekeeping potential of the U.N. may be invoked, to the fullest extent possible under that organization's charter.

Therefore, while we commend our President for his courage and decisive action in this crisis, let us also reaffirm our dedication to maintenance of peace the world over. Let us never shrink from the defense of freedom, but let us never trade lightly on that peace, which is its surest guarantee.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that even amongst the Members of this body there is some misapprehension regarding the President's response to the recent attacks by North Vietnamese PT boats on our naval forces in the Far East. The action taken was a point response and its exceedingly limited nature has been emphasized by the President himself. The attack against us was by PT boats and the response was strictly limited to PT boats at their docks, the docks and supporting installations for the PT boats and the fuel supply for the PT boats. By thus strictly limiting our response to the exact weapons by which the hostile attack was made and by pointedly describing it strictly in terms of a reprisal, the entire question of privileged sanctuaries

has been avoided. Privileged sanctuaries are areas from which Communists have assembled attacking forces without interference, which forces subsequently are dispatched against non-Communist areas. This concept developed during the Korean war when the participants found it desirable to limit the area of the war, as well as some of its other aspects, by tacit agreement.

The correct interpretation of the President's action is thus that the tacit agreement has in no way been altered or abrogated by the U.S. reprisal. Those who quarrel with this interpretation can, at best, claim a slight unilateral revision in the agreement. The revision, under their view, would make point reprisal against the weapons used in a hostile raid permissible if the reprisal can be accomplished by approach from the sea.

As the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has indicated, neither interpretation of these recent events, nor the resolution before us, represent any change in U.S. policy with respect to the steady deterioration of affairs in southeast Asia. Still before us are difficult decisions which have too long been delayed. It is incumbent upon the President to make less clear to the Communists of Peiping just what our intentions are unless these decisions are to be made much more difficult. As things now stand Peiping has every basis to assume that the concept of privileged sanctuary is in full force and effect even if slightly modified. They are invited to use it to the fullest for their own ends.

To accomplish what is needed it is neither necessary for President Johnson to flatly announce abrogation of the privileged sanctuary doctrine or to confirm its continuance. On the contrary what is necessary is for him to restore to the mind of Peiping a real doubt whether it is or is not in force. It is much easier for an aggressor to make his plans according to that which is certain than according to that which is uncertain. Surely this should be apparent to those who are advising the President, including his Secretary of State and his Secretary of Defense. Of course, at some point there arises a desirability for certainty. But obviously that point seldom arises from a crisis triggered by the enemy. It arrives when our own calculations indicate that clarity rather than ambiguity best serves our own purposes.

I believe it unfortunate that the limitation on debate over the resolution before us does not permit a more elucidating discussion of the resolution's meaning. Such a debate also might lay to rest the prevailing accusations that Senator GOLDWATER shoots from the hip, while President Johnson shoots from the ship, while Congress shoots from the lip.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 1145, which is a "sense resolution" expressing the support of the Congress for the recent retaliatory action ordered by the President of the United States against attacking North Vietnamese gunboats and support facilities. In

times of grave national crisis the Congress and the American people have always closed ranks in support of this kind of determined response to unprovoked aggression on the Armed Forces of the United States. We are saddened at the news of the loss and apparent death of two brave men whose planes were shot down in the action that took place this week, and at the apparent capture and the imprisonment of another naval aviator by the North Vietnamese Communists. Yet we know in our hearts that as a great nation it is not always possible to avoid this kind of sacrifice when we are engaged in the defense of our national honor and in the defense of freedom. Therefore, I reiterate that the joint resolution now before this body upholding the hand of the President in this action has my full and unreserved support.

However, I do not think that a manifestation of national unity of purpose with respect to American security interests in Southeast Asia requires us to refrain from some additional comment on the situation that exists there.

It was pointed out in the New York Times for Friday, August 7, 1964, by the distinguished columnist, Mr. James Reston, that the "principle of joint action in mutual danger" was appended to the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China, which was signed in December 1954.

Letters were exchanged by Secretary of State Dulles and Ambassador George K. C. Yeh, of the Republic of China in which the following important understanding was established:

In view of the obligations of the two parties under the said treaty, and of the fact that the use of force from either of these areas (Formosa or the offshore islands) by either of the parties affects the other, it is agreed that such use of force will be a matter of joint agreement, subject to action of an emergency character which is clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defense.

Mr. Speaker, just this morning, radio and press reports informed us that General Khanh of South Vietnam has declared a state of emergency in that country. There are further reports to the effect that General Khanh has stated that this is the week of critical decision in South Vietnam. There are some who have already interpreted his remarks to mean that he may possibly order an invasion of North Vietnam by the forces of South Vietnam that are under his command. In view of earlier reports of differences between General Khanh and other members of his staff and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the head of our military mission to South Vietnam, on the question of a strike into North Vietnam, it seems urgent that we promptly clarify the relationships between our two Governments, and eliminate the possibility of unilateral action in this area. As Mr. Reston points out, such a suggestion would not in the least inhibit either the United States of America or South Vietnam with respect to its inherent and sovereign right of defend itself against aggression. However, I feel that the United

States certainly has a right to expect written assurances from our South Vietnamese allies that any action against North Vietnam must be joint action which has been approved and assented to by both Governments.

It has been stated here on the floor of the House today that this joint resolution does not provide the President with carte blanche authority to launch an all-out war or even limited war in any part of the southeast Asian theater of operations. We are merely expressing our determination to stand firm and resolute as a nation in the face of enemy attack, and to repeal any aggressions. I think it is essential that our State Department and the President of the United States assure the American people that any attack either on North Vietnam or elsewhere in southeast Asia will be in conformity with the "principle of joint action in mutual danger" which Mr. Reston has referred to in his discussion of the Vietnamese situation in his column on Friday, August 7, 1964. We have the precedent of our relations with the Republic of China to guide us in this respect. I do not wish to be misunderstood as expressing any reservations about the peaceful intentions of our Government. I believe completely in the sincerity of the President when he says that we have no imperialistic, political or economic aims in southeast Asia, but rather only a desire to see peace restored to that area of the world—a peace which will permit the people of southeast Asia to live in freedom and not under the threat of the Communist sword. However, because of the elements in the present situation, and particularly because of recent expressions by General Khanh and others in the South Vietnam Government, I think we should make it abundantly clear to them and to the world that even as we expect to consult with our allies too in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization that this principle of consulting is and must be a two-way street.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I will support the resolution for reasons of unity. However, I have grave reservations involving congressional abdication of responsibility in declaring war. I am concerned that our leaders permit other nations, seeking our help, to take us into war. This resolution does not assure us that the President will come back to Congress, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] assured us, before involving this Nation further. I agree to the resolution, therefore, only assuming that Congress will not be bypassed later.

Secondly, what is our position in Vietnam? What about the hundreds of Americans killed, wounded and imprisoned? Are we at war or not? What has been our official policy in Vietnam? How many have been killed, wounded and imprisoned, and what have we been doing to free our men even before the attacks on our ships which occasion this resolution?

Americans are entitled to know the truth. And what about the next of kin? What have they been told about the deaths of their loved ones in this war

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

that has not been a war? How does this resolution square with our earlier Vietnamese losses? Where is consistency in the position of the administration in asking for this resolution when hundreds of U.S. men have been killed, wounded, and imprisoned in Vietnam without a position statement from the President and congressional leaders? Are we at war there or not? Under what congressional authority has the President permitted and justified these deaths? Only Congress can declare war and yet we have been sending American boys into battle for months. We have never been told all the facts of Vietnam.

Finally, the problem remains—what is the U.S. official policy in Asia, and worldwide, vis-a-vis Communist worldwide aggression? This resolution tells us little, if anything. Therefore, I shall vote for it, but in behalf of the people of my district and the people of the United States I shall continue to demand of the administration a clear-cut policy in meeting the challenge of the Communist conspiracy, in Asia and throughout the world.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the expressions offered here today which reflect the unity of the Government and citizens of the United States behind the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces in the determination to respond promptly to unprovoked attacks and resist Communist aggression wherever it asserts itself.

The loss and endangerment of American lives in faraway lands and waters is to be deplored, but certain risks must be accepted in the recognition that we are engaged in a worldwide conflict in which our own national and individual freedoms are inevitably at stake.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 1145, a resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. I shall vote today with the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in approving and supporting the determination of President Lyndon B. Johnson, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

I met with my colleagues in an executive session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday to hear Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who testified in support of the joint congressional resolution calling for the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. A lengthy briefing was provided by Secretaries Rusk and McNamara concerning the recent attacks on U.S. naval vessels in Tonkin Bay and the U.S. responses to these acts of aggression. Following the committee briefing and hearing, the joint resolution was adopted, and the way was cleared for the vote on House Joint Resolution 1145 in this House today.

As Delaware's only Representative in Congress, my vote on this southeast Asia

joint resolution is the fourth occasion under the administrations of three Presidents whereby I have cast my vote in support of national policies to resist acts of Communist aggression against the peace and national security of the United States. Under President Eisenhower's administration I voted for the Middle East resolution and the Formosa resolution, and under President Kennedy's administration, I voted for the Cuba resolution.

We cannot tell what steps may in the future be required to meet Communist aggression in southeast Asia. The unity and determination of the American people, through their Congress, should be declared in terms so firm that they cannot possibly be mistaken by other nations.

I agree with President Johnson that the United States, and indeed the whole world, has met the tests, learned the lessons, and experienced the fearful costs of man's efforts to achieve peace on earth.

I support President Johnson in the face of this peril. The preservation of the spirit and faith of our Nation does, and will, furnish the highest justification for every sacrifice that we may make in the protection and perpetuation of the integrity of the United States and of democracy through the free world.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the joint resolution on southeast Asia and to applaud the action ordered by President Lyndon B. Johnson against the unprovoked acts of Communist aggression in the Gulf of Tonkin. Our President has acted with the dignity and firmness appropriate to the leader of the combined forces of the free world alliance and he deserves our unflinching support for any further steps which he might deem necessary in the days and months ahead. The forthrightness of his action has demonstrated the prudence of his judgment. We need not worry about placing additional power and authority in his hands.

The President has demonstrated coolness under pressure and an understanding of the complexity of international relations. His forceful and deliberate action evidenced a keen awareness of Communist respect for controlled force. Yet the careful way in which he limited targets to those directly supporting the aggressor vessels demonstrates an awareness of the dangers of uncontrolled or emotional escalation of force in an age of nuclear weaponry. Our stature as a world leader has been strengthened among both friends and foes, yet we have not been forced into committing ourselves to a hot war in the jungles of North Vietnam.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 1145 with an amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there

were—yeas 416, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—416

Abbitt	Delaney	Hull
Abele	Dent	Hutchinson
Abernethy	Denton	Ichord
Adair	Derounian	Jarman
Addabbo	Derwinski	Jennings
Albert	Devine	Jensen
Alger	Diggs	Joelson
Anderson	Dingell	Johansen
Andrews, Ala.	Dole	Johnson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Donohue	Johnson, Pa.
Arends	Dorn	Johnson, Wis.
Ashbrook	Dowdy	Jonas
Ashley	Downing	Jones, Ala.
Ashmore	Dulski	Karsten
Aspinall	Duncan	Karsh
Auchincloss	Dwyer	Kastenmeier
Avery	Edmondson	Keith
Ayres	Edwards	Kelly
Baker	Elliott	Keogh
Baldwin	Ellsworth	Kilburn
Barrett	Everett	Kilgore
Barry	Evens	King, Calif.
Bass	Fallon	King, N.Y.
Bates	Farbstein	Kirwan
Battin	Fascell	Kluczynski
Becker	Feighan	Knox
Beermann	Findley	Kornegay
Belcher	Finnegan	Kunkel
Bell	Fino	Kyl
Bennett, Fla.	Fisher	Laird
Berry	Flood	Landrum
Betts	Flynt	Langen
Blatnik	Fogarty	Latta
Boggs	Ford	Leggett
Boland	Foreman	Lesinski
Bolling	Forrester	Libonati
Bolton	Fountain	Lindsay
Bolton, Frances P.	Fraser	Lipscomb
Bolton, Oliver P.	Frelinghuysen	Lloyd
Bonner	Friedel	Long, La.
Bow	Fulton, Pa.	McClary
Brademas	Fulton, Tenn.	McCulloch
Bray	Fuqua	McDade
Brock	Gallagher	McDowell
Bromwell	Garmatz	McFall
Brooks	Gary	McIntire
Broomfield	Gathings	McLoskey
Brotzman	Glaimo	McMillan
Brown, Calif.	Gibbons	Macdonald
Brown, Ohio	Gilbert	MacGregor
Broyhill, N.C.	Gill	Madden
Broyhill, Va.	Glenn	Mahon
Bruce	Gonzalez	Mailliard
Buckley	Goodell	Marsh
Burke	Goodling	Martin, Calif.
Burkhalter	Grabowski	Martin, Mass.
Burleson	Grant	Martin, Nebr.
Burton, Calif.	Gray	Mathias
Burton, Utah	Green, Oreg.	Matsunaga
Byrne, Pa.	Green, Pa.	Matthews
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffin	May
Cahill	Griffiths	Meador
Cameron	Gross	Michel
Carey	Grover	Miller, Calif.
Casey	Gubser	Miller, N.Y.
Cederberg	Gurney	Milliken
Celler	Hagen, Calif.	Mills
Chamberlain	Haley	Minish
Chelf	Hall	Minshall
Chenoweth	Halleck	Monagan
Clancy	Halpern	Montoya
Clark	Hanna	Moore
Clausen	Hansen	Moorhead
Clawson, Del.	Harding	Morgan
Cleveland	Hardy	Morris
Cohelan	Harris	Morrison
Collier	Harrison	Morse
Colmer	Harsha	Morton
Conte	Harvey, Ind.	Mosher
Cooley	Harvey, Mich.	Moss
Corbett	Hawkins	Multer
Corman	Hays	Murphy, Ill.
Cramer	Healey	Murphy, N.Y.
Cunningham	Hebert	Murray
Curtin	Henderson	Natcher
Curtis	Herlong	Nedzi
Daddario	Hoeven	Nelsen
Dague	Hoffman	Nix
Daniels	Hollifield	O'Brien, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Holland	O'Hara, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	Horan	O'Hara, Mich.
Dawson	Horton	O'Konski
	Hosmer	Olsen, Mont.
	Huddleston	Olsen, Minn.
		O'Neill

August 7

Osmer	Boyal	Thomas
Ostertag	Burnsfield	Thompson, La.
Patman	Ryan, Mich.	Thompson, N.J.
Patten	Ryan, N.Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Pelly	St. George	Thomson, Wis.
Pepper	St. Germain	Toll
Perkins	St. Onge	Tollefson
Philbin	Saylor	Trimble
Pickle	Schadeberg	Tuck
Pike	Schenck	Tupper
Pflicher	Schneebell	Tuten
Pillion	Schweiker	Udall
Pirnie	Schwengel	Ullman
Poage	Scott	Utt
Poff	Secrest	Van Deerlin
Price	Selden	Van Felt
Pucinski	Senner	Vinson
Purcell	Shoppard	Waggonner
Quile	Shipley	Wallhauser
Quillen	Short	Watson
Rains	Shriver	Watts
Randall	Sibal	Weaver
Reid, Ill.	Sickles	Weitner
Reid, N.Y.	Sikes	Westland
Reifel	Sisk	Whalley
Reuss	Skubitz	Wharton
Rhodes, Ariz.	Slack	White
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Calif.	Whitener
Rich	Smith, Iowa	Whitten
Riehlman	Smith, Va.	Wickersham
Rivers, Alaska	Snyder	Widnall
Rivers, S.C.	Springer	Williams
Roberts, Ala.	Staebler	Willis
Roberts, Tex.	Stafford	Wilson, Bob
Robison	Staggers	Wilson,
Rodino	Steed	Charles H.
Rogers, Colo.	Stephens	Wilson, Ind.
Rogers, Fla.	Stinson	Winstead
Rogers, Tex.	Stratton	Wright
Rooney, N.Y.	Stubblefield	Wyder
Rooney, Pa.	Sullivan	Wyman
Roosevelt	Taft	Young
Rosenthal	Talcott	Younger
Rostenkowski	Taylor	Zablocki
Roudebush	Teague, Calif.	
Roush	Teague, Tex.	

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Powell

NOT VOTING—14

Baring	Kee	Passman
Beckworth	Lankford	Pool
Bennett, Mich.	Lennon	Siler
Hagan, Ga.	Long, Md.	Vanik
Jones, Mo.	Norblad	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Beckworth and Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Siler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Passman with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Lankford.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Vanik.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 205, on August 5, a quorum call,

I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in rollcall No. 210, I was unavoidably detained on important business relating to my district and could not answer to my name. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" as I have already personally pledged my support and the support of my district to the President of the United States in this hour of emergency.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was Plato who once said that "he who commits injustice is ever made more wretched than he who suffers it." Remorse has been my constant companion since I learned of the injustice suffered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL]. In a shooting war, Mr. Speaker, more often than not it is the innocent who are caught in the crossfire.

On Tuesday, in a colloquy on the pay bill conference report between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] and myself, frequent allusion was made to the "Randall report" and a certain Mr. Randall. The discussion appears on page 4123 of the Appendix in the Record of Wednesday August 5. The Mr. Randall to whom we referred was not my colleague from Missouri, the Honorable Mr. WILLIAM RANDALL; it was Mr. Clarence Randall, chairman of the board of Inland Steel, who headed the President's Advisory Panel of Federal Compensation. On behalf of my colleague from Michigan, may I extend our humble apologies for any mental suffering which the gentleman from Missouri may have suffered as a result of this clerical error.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT VIETNAM RESOLUTION

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution because I completely concur with the premise stated by President Johnson that "firmness in the right is indispensable today for peace."

I have been voicing that conviction throughout my entire service in this House.

The first legislative vote I cast as a Member of this House—in January 1955—was in support of the Formosan resolution which has already been re-

ferred to in this debate. I said on that occasion that:

We can only hope and pray that "firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right" will prevent both war and the further spread and strengthening of tyranny.

I believe Congress should and will overwhelmingly approve this resolution.

The one question—the one unknown—is whether the administration will actually persist in the policy of firmness it has proclaimed. There have been occasions where the followthrough of firmness was something less than the initial commitment to firmness.

The acid test is the degree and the persistence of that commitment this time.

That test remains to be met. May we not be found wanting or wavering.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 207, on August 6, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on House Joint Resolution 1145, I was called to the long-distance telephone on several urgent long-distance calls and did not hear the second bells.

If I had not been so occupied, I would have voted in support of the resolution. I am in support of President Johnson's actions and decisions in southeast Asia.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, included in my extended remarks on page A4161 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 6, 1964, is a noteworthy poem by Mrs. Nancy Sanes, who, in fact, is the wife of Milton Sanes, a highly esteemed constituent. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be corrected to delete the words "daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Milton Sanes" and to substitute therefor the words "wife of Milton Sanes." There is no unlaunt over the letter "n" in the name Sanes and I ask unanimous consent that the spelling be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee